DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 255 95 UD 015 656

AUTHOR	Singh, S. P.
TITLE	Dynamics of Deprivation and Educational Implications -- Some Hypotheses and Impressions. An Interdisciplinary Sensorium Report.
INSTITUTION	University of South Florida, Tampa. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 74
GRANT	OEG-0-70-1816(7251)
NOTE	160p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$8.24 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Child Development; *Conference Reports; Cultural Disadvantagement; *Disadvantaged Environment; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Problems; Environmental Research; Heterogeneous Grouping; Homogeneous Grouping; Labeling (of Persons); Language; *Learning Disabilities; Learning Experience; Learning Modalities; Linguistics; Research Problems; School Role; Sensory Deprivation

ABSTRACT

The present report on the sensorium includes the general format, hypotheses, procedures, and contributions of the participants. For the purpose of the study, different sets of variables, hypotheses and procedures were chosen. The variables included the collective and overall perceptions of individuals representing various academic disciplines. It is hypothesized that professionals representing various disciplines related to the problems of deprivation as perceived here would substantiate a number of points -- that the syndrome of deprivation and disadvantagement is universal and affects all in general and greater in specific groups of individuals within a given time and space, and that stylistic features displayed by individuals under deprived conditions are universal. Issues discussed in sensorium are: labeling, types of learning; disadvantaged children; teaching styles and methodologies; effect of the schools on children; language/linguistics; community; school relevancy; segregation/integration; children's growth and development; dominance theory in sociology change within the schools; the ideal school; homogeneous/heterogeneous school groupings; observation of the child; evaluation of the child; evaluation of school programs; teacher preparation and behavior; and survival and institution. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

UD 015 656

Dynamics of Deprivation and Educational Implications--

Some Hypotheses and Impressions

An Interdisciplinary Sensorium Report

Contract No. OEG 0-70-1816 (7251)

ED117255

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

S. P. Singh, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
Project Director

August 1974

The study reported herein was conducted pursuant to a training contract with BEPD, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Point of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

UD015 656

College of Education
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Contributors*

Dr. Herbert Aurbach, Professor, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, 220 Rackley Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Mr. Erskine Caldwell, Author, Novelist, P. O. Box 820, Dunedin, Florida 33528

Dr. Joan Duval, Chief, Early Childhood Division, BEPD, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Robert Dwyer, Associate Professor, College of Education, Universit of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620

Dr. Edward Fagan, Professor of English Education, College of Education Pennsylvania State University, 163 Chambers Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Dr. Marguerite Follett, Early Childhood Branch, BEPD, United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Fred Gearing, Professor, Department of Anthropology, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York 14226.

Dr. Charles Keith, Child Psychologist, Durham, North Carolina.

Mr. Edward Moore, Special Education/Early Childhood, BEPD, Office of Education, U.S.O.E., Washington, D. C.

Ms. Sheila MacCambridge, Assistant Professor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Harry Passow, Professor of Education and Department Chairman, Teacher's College, Columbia University, New York City, New York 10027.

Dr. Raymond Patouillet, Professor of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Surendra P. Singh, Associate Professor, Department of Special Education, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Ms. Jean Stovall, Instructor, College of Education, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Lester Tuttle, Professor of Education, St. Petersburg Campus, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Richard Waterman, Professor, Department of Anthropology, Universit of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620.

Dr. Robert Weatherford, Associate Professor, Coordinator for Potential Handicapped Program, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, 33620.

---

*Addresses as of June 10, 1970.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present report on the sensorium conducted on June 8, 9, and 10, 1970 includes the general format, hypotheses, procedures and contributions of the participants.

I wish to thank Drs. Joan Duval, Marguerite Follett, Malcolm Davis, and Edward Moore of BEPD, Office of Education for their continuous support of the program. The financial support of this office was greatly appreciated in the conducting of this sensorium.

For the contributions and participation, I am indebted to Dr. Herbert Aurbach, Mr. Erskine Caldwell, Dr. Joan Duval, Dr. Robert Dwyer, Dr. Edward Fagan, Dr. Marguerite Follett, Dr. Fred Gearing, Dr. Charles Keith, Mr. Edward Moore, Ms. Sheila McCambridge, Dr. Harry Passow, Dr. Raymond Patouillet, Ms. Jean Stoval Dr. Lester Tuttle, Dr. Richard Waterman, and Dr. Robert Weatherford.

My special thanks to Dr. Robert Weatherford who encouraged such a venture from its inception, provided valuable suggestions and acted as moderator for several sessions.

Much hard work, frequently far beyond the call of duty has gone into the report. Many thanks to Ms. Sherry Randolph and Ms. Norma Mathews who put this report through their typing skill and enormous patience in our hand.

College of Education
University of South Florida
Surendra P. Singh

Preface, Hypotheses and General Procedures

Surendra P Singh

Deprivation, which connotes and denotes to some extent, a condition creating a sense of loss or deprivation. This may be psychological, sociological, educational or physiological in nature, effecting learning and behavior and consequently retarding the educational (3 R's and psycho-social development) performance.

The area of deprivation study has become one of the most discusse topics during the last two decades. The outstanding studies of D. O. Hebb and others at McGill University in one of the aspects of deprivation, i.e. sensory deprivation, has created enormous interest. The general area of deprivation study seems to have the potential to provide some answers to crucial and complex issues such as the impact of psycho-social deprivation, ethnocentric and egocentric behavior, dichotomized and polarized institutional variables on sensory modalities and consequently on human growth and development.

Research such as Myklebust (1960), Klein (1962), have demonstrate the effect of social and cognitive deprivation relating to deafness and blindness. Dennis and Dennis (1951), demonstrated the effect of restricted environments during human's ,assumed childhood. The importance of environmental stimulation in the development of human intellect has been stressed by outstanding work of J. McV Hunt (1961). However, these studies are still in their infancy and require rigorous effort in analysis of unexplored territory.

For the purpose of the current study, as follows, somewhat different sets of variables, hypotheses and procedures were chosen. The variables included the collective and overall perceptions of individuals representing various academic diciplines.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesis that professionals representing various disciplines related to the problem of deprivation as perceived here (see the definition of terms) will substantiate that the

1. Syndrome of deprivation and disadvantagement is universal and effects all in general and greater in specific groups of individuals within a given time and space.
2. Stylistic features displayed by individuals under deprived conditions are universal.
3. Ecology of educational approaches (personnel, teaching techniques, materials and physical conditions) in schools ar incongruent to human development, thus creating a set of learning disabilities in the form of 'incongruencies of behavior and adaptation.'
4. Ethnocentric and egocentric behavior and the institutions effected heavily with such phenomenon foster projection, displacement and rationalization thus creating conditions for deprivation.
5. Institutional dynamics and structure of polarity and dichoto creates situations and traits that tends to foster depriva

6. Reality and nature of isolation and existence of superfluous lines among various disciplines may be one of the variables fostering certain types of deprivation.
7. Universals of human feelings and thoughts can be studied through such a sensorium format.

General Procedures:

Professionals representing different disciplines such as psychology, sociology, anthropology and education were contacted at various universities in the U.S. by mail (see letters in appendix for content). Following the response to the first letter, a second letter was sent to individuals who agreed to participate informing the general intent of the sensorium. (See appendix B)

The sensorium was conducted for three days, June 8, 9, and 10, 1970. Participants were encouraged to focus on the issues of educatio for the disadvantaged and conditions generating deprivation, thus fostering disadvantagement.

First two days were devoted for general discussion, during which participants mentioned many issues around the main topic (see the list of main issues). The third day some concluding remarks and recommendations were made, (see concluding impressions.)

All sessions were audio-taped. However, due to the technical problems and lack of clarity, the original transcript was given the typescript format followed by synopsis and reactions. Panel members are identified by their names in most instances, nevertheless, again due to technical problems at several occasions, remarks are not being identified by names. Over all report including transcript, synopsis and reactions are kept as objective as possible.

Operational Definitions

Sensorium 1) Discussion for opening of thoughts, free exchange of ideas, and feelings; 2) Process of destifling sensory modalities in the search for some answers to questions 3) Process of analys of attributes and multiplicity of meanings of frequently used words; 4) situation where critical analysis of assumptions generating and fostering the disruption of human ecology can be discussed.

Learning Disability Learning disability is a 1) consequence of inadequate and incongruent learning conditions and 2) functional discrepant outcome of incongruent concept formation. Its origin is in 1) the lack of understanding of developmental concept formation among teachers, parents and societal educational performance and 2) educational tasks incongruent to the child's developmental capacity.

Disadvantaged Effected adversely by specific psycho-social and educational situations in general and certain specific groups of individuals in a given time and space in particular.

Deprivation: A psycho-social and educational condition creating a sense of loss or a sense of being deprived and consequently effecting learning.

Learning A process of acquisition of 3 R's and survival skills in a given time and space.

The following pages of typescript, synopsis, highlights, concluding impressions and the appendix (selected quotes) shall provide a reader substantive material for thought regarding variables, hypotheses and procedures.

References

Dennis, W., Infant Development Under Conditions of Restricted practice and of Minimum Social Stimulation. Gent. Psychol. Monogr. 1941, 23, 143-149.

Hebb, D. O., The Organization of Behavior. New York Wiley, 1949, 405b-415.

Hunt, J. Mc V., Intelligence and Experience. New York Ronald, 1961.

Klein, A S. Blindness and Social Isolation Psycho-analytic Study of the Child, 1962, 17 82-93.

Myklebust, H R , The Psychology of Deafness Sensory Deprivation. Learning and Adjustment. New York Grune and Stratton, 1960.

ISSUES DISCUSSED IN SENSORIUM

1.0 LABELING

2.0 TYPES OF LEARNING

3.0 DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN

4.0 TEACHING STYLES AND METHODOLOGIES

5.0 EFFECT OF THE SCHOOLS ON CHILDREN

6.0 LANGUAGE/LINGUISTICS

7.0 COMMUNITY

8.0 SCHOOL RELEVANCY

9.0 SEGREGATION/INTEGRATION

10.0 CHILDREN'S GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

11.0 DOMINANCE THEORY IN SOCIOLOGY

12.0 CHANGE WITHIN THE SCHOOLS

13.0 THE IDEAL SCHOOL

14.0 HOMOGENEOUS/HETEROGENEOUS SCHOOL GROUPINGS

15.0 OBSERVATION OF THE CHILD

16.0 EVALUATION OF THE CHILD

17.0 EVALUATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS

18.0 TEACHER PREPARATION AND BEHAVIOR

19.0 SURVIVAL AND INSTITUTION

General Format

First Session

June 8, 1970 — 9 a.m. to 12 noon

Dean's Conference Room
SSO Building, Ground Floor

The session was devoted to establish

1. ground rules for the following session
2. each participant suggested the content for discussion and its disciplines' stand in regard to the problems under discussion (deprivation and disadvantagement)

Second Session

June 8, 1970 — 2 p.m. to 4 30 p.m. Dean's Conf. Rm. SSO Bld

The second session was devoted to spontaneous discussion by total group on the presuppositions and ground rules established during the first session.

Third Session

June 9, 1970 — 9 a.m. to 12 noon Dean's Conf. Rm. SSO Bldg.

The third session was devoted to dialogue to formulate hypothesis and ideas for alleviatin the problems.

Fourth Session

June 9, 1970 — 2 p.m. to 4 30 p.m. Dean's Conf. Rm. SSO Bld

The fourth session was devoted to the synthes of interchange and dialogue of the first three sessions to be reported in the fifth open session.

Fifth Session

June 10, 1970 — 9 a.m. to 12 noon U.C. 252 East

The participants appeared before the students and faculty members and reported their points of view.

General Recommendations

1. Labels needs to be put into right perspective, utilized only as an administrative construct and considered as means rather than ends in itself.

2. Alternate plans ought to be available for the acquisition of learning.

3. Myths of homogeneity needs to be realized and heterogeneity respected.

4. Development of cohesive and empathetic classroom atmosphere should be a focal point.

5. Attempt must be made to break the cycle of psycho-social isolation among education personnel in general and children in particular.

6. Building of self confidence among all (teachers, parents, children teacher educators, etc.) must be stressed.

7. Develop survival skills among children.

8. Concept of pluralism needs to be internalized.

9. Learning must be fostered in a natural way.

10. Psycho-social condition creating disadvantagement needs to be studied and ameliorated.

11. Schools must become personalized rather than depersonalized bureaucratic structure.

12. Educational components needs to be studied as parts and parts of the whole (human development) together.

13. Education personnel must become sensitized with plurality and self accepting attitudes and become aware of real problems rather than dwelling into the projections and displacements.

14. Team teaching should become a process of utilization of resources for the betterment of education rather than turn taking mechanism.

15. Teachers to be recognized as professionals must accept the responsibilities there to and need not be supervised.

16. Individuals in the field of education must study their personal biases and prejudices as these operate in an instructional situation.

17. Teachers need to become aware of procedures related to assessment and individualized instruction.

18. Language to be considered as a mean for the purpose of communication and be modified accordingly.

19. Re-assess the existing educational assumptions according to the current context.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Contributors i

Acknowledgements ii

Preface, Hypotheses and General Procedures iii-vii

Issues Discussed in Sensorium viii

General Format ix

General Recommendations x-xi

Typescript Outline, Synopsis, Reaction

A Typescript Outline 1
  Synopsis 1-4
  Reaction 4

B Typescript Outline 5-7
  Synopsis 8-10
  Reaction 10-11

C Typescript Outline 12-13
  Synopsis 14-15
  Reaction 16

D Typescript Outline 17-19
  Synopsis 19-22
  Reaction 22

E Typescript Outline 23-26
  Synopsis 26-30
  Reaction 30-31

F Typescript Outline 32-33
  Synopsis 33-35
  Reaction 35

G Typescript Outline 36-39
  Synopsis 40-42
  Reaction 42

H. Typescript Outline 43-44
  Synopsis 44-45
  Reaction 45

I Typescript Outline 46-49
Synopsis 50-52
Reaction 52-53

J Typescript Outline 54-56
Synopsis 56-58
Reaction 58

K Typescript Outline 59-61
Synopsis 61-62
Reaction 62-63

L. Typescript Outline 64-66
Synopsis 67-69
Reaction 69-70

M Typescript Outline 71-73
Synopsis 73-75
Reaction 75-76

N Typescript Outline 77-79
Synopsis 79-81
Reaction 81-82

O Typescript Outline 83-84
Synopsis 84-86
Reaction 86

P Typescript Outline 87-94
Synopsis 95-101
Reaction 102-103

Concluding Impressions

1. Harry Passow 104-109

2. Erskine Caldwell 110-112

3. Herbert Aurbach 113-118

4. Charles Keith 119-121

5. Raymond Patouillet 122-123

6. Fred Gearing 124-130

7. Edward Fagan 131-135

Selected Point of View 136-142

Appendix A

Appendix B

SECTION A

Typescript Outline

1.0 Initial recountation of scope/issues of the multi-phasic sensorium

    1.1 "The problem of educating the disadvantaged child"

    1.2 "To work on all of the problems of the disadvantaged child"

2.0 Recountation of the areas and disciplines involved in the seminar

    2.1 The novel

    2.2 Special Education

    2.3 Child Psychology

    2.4 Sociology

    2.5 Philosophy

    2.6 Psychology

    2.7 Urban Education

    2.8 Curriculum Development

3.0 Basic attributes of the sensorium

    3.1 Attempt to view the concept and implications of questions related to disadvantagement

        3.1.1 Impact of labeling on children

        3.1.2 Question of current situation in education

            3.1.2.1 Head Start programs

            3.1.2.2 Heterogeneous vs. homogeneous groupings

            3.1.2.3 Effect of student grouping on student/teacher relationship

Synopsis

Afternoon session: After introductory "business", the session began, naming a moderator, recounting the scope of the previous session and restating the disciplines of the individuals present. The question and the scope is "the problem of educating the disadvantaged child";

the disciplines involved are, the novel, Special Education, Child Psychology, Sociology, Psychology, Philosophy, Urban Education and Curriculum Development. The moderator then restated that the focus of the sensorium was to "work on all of the problems" of the disadvantaged child and gave a short synopsis of the previous session. Issues discussed included the effect of curriculum on the disadvantaged child, the effect of labeling on the child, educational strategies, Head Start heterogeneous vs. homogeneous student groupings and classroom atmospher and communication. Areas of emphasis in this session were labeling and its effect on all children and strategies and structural principles involved in a global program designed to "help kids in this area right across the board". Also recounted was previous discussion on criticism of the "present system": the tendency of Head Start and other programs to "grind up kids", and the question of value systems as related to questions such as heterogeneous vs. homogeneous groupings and the teacher/student relationship and its effect on learning.

The discussion then centered on Dr. Patouillet and the issue of communication as a methodology in combatting the problem of school dropouts. Salient points were made that the school was not related to the vocational goals of children and that the focus of education needed to be on the individual. Dr. Patouillet, then, after relating some personal experiences with grades/term papers/rote learning, introduced the concept of the REAP. The REAP is a construct he created. The components are:

R	Reaction	individual, personal reaction to course material; this reaction may be from any sourc home, job, etc.
E	Exploration	described by Dr. Patouillet as "old fashioned thinking" on the issue at hand
A	Application	the answer to questions such as "so what?" and "where does this lead me?"
P	Production	the actual production of the REAP

The REAP was then illustrated through several examples: an unname "structural/physical" project depicting school functions (instruction, administration, guidance) and three watercolor paintings. These paintings, which were REAPs, and shown to the panel, depicted "Guidanc as the Visualization of Self", "The World of Nature and Things" and the "World of the I-Thou" (Buber from I and Thou). These paintings were then discussed and explained as illustrative of REAPs. An additional REAP was then shown by Dr. Patouillet: this being an example of work done by an eighth grade student. It consisted of a painting and "a little series of sentences to go with it", describing that the "boy is very sad" and the "he doesn't like the life he is living". Dr. Patouillet then posited that in learning situations such as this students learn more. Following this description, Dr. Patouillet recounted another learning experiment: a student affected hippie garb to personally study feelings and reactions people might have, only to find that this illicited similar reactions in a black student in the class. He stopped short, but related that he felt that this example and the REAPs illustrated alternative evaluation and instructional viewpoints as contrasted with the more structured conception of education. He closed, restating his view that such techniques functic to "open the doors of experience and make no two classes the same", and also offer "innumerable new learning activities".

The point was then made by Dr. Fagan that Dr. Patouillet's examples closely paralleled the McLuhan concept of communication and the title "Sensorium" chosen by Dr. Singh from McLuhan's thought. It offers innumerable opportunities for a new perception and a new insight even at the elementary levels. The idea that the content of education is something to be lodged in the minds as a container thus belongs to the pre-electronic phase and to the area of Euclidian Space and Newtonian Mechanics. A structure cannot be contained. Any conceivable container is at once part of the structure modifying the whole. Two additional anecdotes were offered by panel members, following the groundwork laid by Dr. Patouillet. One panel member related that the book 36 Children (Herbert Kohl) made use of fable as a learning device, and a second related the experience of his colleagues at an Indian reservation. In this endeavor, children were provided with cameras and film and left to "do their own thing", in an unstructured learning environment, with excellent results.

Reaction

The topic of "relevancy and communication" in the education of the disadvantaged was discussed. The questions such as "labeling", "instructional atmosphere", and "classroom strategies" were also brought before the panel for discussions. The panel decided to begin with Dr. Patouillet's presentation of his idea through the REAP. The REAP as illustrative of a technique to unstructure learning opportunities was described and illustrated through several examples and illicited panel interest. Additional comments were made by panel members, both focusing on the question investigated by Dr. Patouillet.

SECTION B

Typescript Outline

1.0 Continuation of discussion on learning as a means of expression

1.1 Dr. Patouillet's example of "Peanuts" -- learning can be "painful"

1.1.1 Learning as "painful"

1.1.1.1 Question as to whether it must be painful

1.1.1.2 Learning as "kind of change"

1.1.1.3 Question of "type of change"

1.2 Types of learning

1.2.1 Learning comes best when it is "integrated" into life of the student.

1.2.1.1 Anecdote of teaching math to 5 year olds

1.2.2 Question of sensitization -- desensitization

1.2.2.1 Sensitivity to new learning experiences

1.2.2.2 Question of learner/material match -- "pieces fit together and learning is natural and easy."

1.2.2.3 "Match" as method of making learning "unpainful"

1.2.3 Piagetian concept of learning

1.2.3.1 Panel member relates the Piagetian model of development.

1.2.4 Integration of concepts of learning and education

1.2.4.1 Dilemma of knowledge as new experience and teaching as old

1.2.4.2 Dr. Patouillet's concept that education is "moving of ideas into different planes of perception."

1.2.4.3 Dr. **Patouillet's** explaining above concept by counseling example of student wanting to go to New York (child discussed in Section A, line 4.1.2.3) .

1.2.4.3.1 Dr. Patouillet's discussion of methods of working with this child

1.2.4.3.2 Aurbach discussion of learning as "making school experience more meaningful".

1.2.4.3.2.1 Aurbach -- keep kid in school, look to school for answers, not out.

1.2.4.3.3 Dr. Patouillet's rebuttal of Aurbach -- student needs method of expression.

1.2.5 Patouillet's re-introduction of the REAP and discussio

2.0 Advantaged and disadvantaged children

2.1 Discussion of learning and the teacher

2.1.1 Discussion of student mentioned in Section B, 1.2.4.3 and Section A, 2.1.2.3 as to membership as "advantaged" or "disadvantaged"

2.1.2 Question of the teachers' role with students

2.1.2.1 Question of "conflict of generations"

2.1.3 Discussion of reaching disadvantaged students

2.1.3.1 Use of Piagetian concepts

2.1.3.2 How do we "reach" these students?

2.1.3.3 Are we failing in our attempts to reach these students?

2.1.3.4 Dr. Patouillet: attempt is to make these students "integrated" and "developed" people.

2.1.3.4.1 Panel member: it is easier to reach these students than adults.

2.1.3.5 Question of student/teacher "match" with disadvantaged

2.1.4 Question of broader aspects of teaching

2.1.4.1 Dr. Patouillet -- students must acquire own motivation for teaching.

2.1.4.1.1 Question of dependability -- students' dependence on the teacher and its effects on both

2.1.4.1.2 Teaching as method of coping/ social integration/social survival

2.1.4.1.2.1 Stereotype of middle class child as adaptive to above

2.1.4.1.2.2 Refutation of 2.1.4.1.2.1

2.1.4.2 Accountability

2.1.4.2.1 *Must* reach all students to achieve accountability

2.1.4.2.2 Accountability as related to differing student social/psychological types

2.1.4.2.3 Postion of the teacher within an accountability based system

2.1.4.2.4 Question of position of students in accountability based system

2.1.4.3 Return to Aurbach's comment that schools "did not meet demands of the kids" and that schools "were not appropriate for disadvantaged kids".

2.1.4.3.1 Aurbach -- my information is vicarious through my students.

2.1.4.3.1.1 "relativity" classroom behavior

2.1.4.3.1.2 Opinion that disadvantaged environment is causal in some behavior

2.1.4.3.1.3 Task of making education relevant to students

2.1.4.3.2 Question of Aurbach -- should we abandon the question of environmental influences on education?

2.1.4.3.2.1 Aurbach -- we need to closely reexamine.

2.1.4.3.2.2 Aurbach suggests stud of Martin Deutsch Pro

2.1.4.3.3 Aurbach -- educators need to find which "auditory clues" the child responds to.

2.1.4.3.4 Aurbach -- don't know how to reach some children.

Synopsis

The panel continued its discussion on the study of learning as a means of student expression. Also included was the precept that educators must attempt to allow, albeit facilitate, more "open" learning experiences.

The initial comments were a continuation of the views held by Dr. Patouillet in the previous section. Recounting a citation from "Peanuts", his comment focused on the fact that many times learning, as embracing a change, can be a painful experience. The panel then, through two contributions, investigated the point of learning as a "painful" experience, and "what kind of change" (type) and "the degree of change" (quantity) might be related to painful experience. Dr. Singh brought a point that perhaps it is the less sensitivity for accepting change which makes learning a painful experience. Dr. Aurbach backed this point by stating that learning is painful at precisely the point where you need a new parody to assimilate that which is coming in. Some consensus was achieved, however, as the middle ground that the optimal condition for learning is to be found within close student/subject matter match. It was assumed that the "match" could facilitate learning: to make it "mutual and easy". Dr. Patouillet in response to this point, then posited the view that, "we can get some sort of help from a kind of Piagetian model" to explain the "intellectual coping" paradigm. In explaining such a position, Patouillet illustrated an additional REAP. For Dr. Patouillet, the REAP followed the "Piagetian" and "match" constructs, in the concept of education as "moving of ideas into different planes of perception."

The discussion then changed focus slightly to a study of "advantaged" and "disadvantaged" children and teachers/teaching. A panel member, in responding to these areas, confronted the question of the teachers' role in working with students of heterogeneous socio-economic compositions.

Question was then made of the "generation gap" and "teacher role" in the attempt to "reach" disadvantaged children. Panel members contributed additional insights into the questions of teaching strategies and methodologies to be used with this student.

A new point of view was introduced that perhaps "it is easier to reach these children than the parents" and perhaps parents might also be reached. The inclusion of reactive parents as a probable method functioned as an entree to the discussion of the theory of dependability, described as "students' dependence on the teacher, and its effects on both". Teaching was then described as "an attempt to develop social integration and survival behaviors in students."

The question of dependency and independency was one of the focal points. It was also brought out by Dr. Singh and Aurbach that perhaps it is about time to address certain questions to ourself first before addressing to others, especially if we assumed that clarifications and understanding of "self" generates independence. The process of understanding "self", it was suggested, might help in clarifying the muddled projection and displacement which we as teacher educators and teachers might have in our behavior. Dr. Aurbach further stated that if I'm not able to reach that child, then the most part of it I don't understand myself. He stressed the fact that there is some sort of identity among all of us within the self.

Panel focus was then altered slightly, when a member initiated the discussion of "accountability", positing that it was initially started by blacks, a disadvantaged group. Points were made that consensus had not yet been realized as to what accountability "is", on what the positions are of the students and teachers in an accountability based system and on the more global question of relating accountability to differing student/teacher personalities.

The discussion then quickly returned to Aurbach, who had made the supposition that schools "did not meet the demands of disadvantaged students." Aurbach then explained his statement, relating that, although the information was derived vicariously, he was of the opinion that classroom behavior was to be understood as relativistic in nature, stemming from the "environmental circumstances" of the students. He closed, calling for increased study, a la Martin Deutsch, of the question of environmental factors on the disadvantaged child. Reemphasizin the "relativity" factor of behavior which he felt quite important, especially when working with disadvantaged children.

Reaction

In Section B, both the tone and the format of the sensorium changed dramatically. In Section A, the greatest amount of time was spent by relating his personal conception of educational relevancy, the REAP. In Section B, however, the sensorium has begun to employ group procedures in addressing the question of disadvantagement.

Major areas covered in this section were students, teachers and especially teaching. Areas within these broad categories were discussed: an investigation of learning, school relevancy and accountability, teacher and teaching methodologies and the beginning of a "zeroing in" on the subject of the disadvantaged child.

The major contributor was Dr. Aurbach, the sociologist, who called for a radical reinvestigation of the schools in what they are/are not doing about the disadvantaged child per se. His major suppositions were that the question of environmental influences on classroom behavior warrants reinvestigation and that school is simply not relevant to these individuals.

The comments of Dr. Aurbach were quite profound, and although, he posits himslef as an outsider, not an educational practitioner, the comments were perceived by the panel as insightful and relevant.

Typescript Outline

1.0 Question of periods and scheduling

1.1 Scheduling and time

1.1.1 Question of the relevancy of time to disadvantaged students

2.0 Dr. Aurbach

2.1 Response to Dr. Aurbach's previous point: reinvestigation of environmental factors on education

2.1.1 Point made by panel member that information to validate idea that environment contributes to educational success or failure does not exist

2.1.1.1 Point validated by anecdote about 4 and 5 year old children

2.1.1.2 Generalization about any social group of children cannot be made

2.1.1.3 Children are "pigeon holed" by social class in unrealistic categories

2.2 Question of social science investigation procedures in education

2.2.1 Data derived is circumspect as "one stylistic system transposed into another stylistic system"

2.2.2 Question of education not as education but as "introduction into a life style"

2.2.2.1 Bias of speaker is towards the "3 R's"

2.2.2.1.1 "3 R's" is the "hard core" of success or failure

2.2.2.1.2 Teaching basic skills must begin at age four rather than six

2.2.2.1.3 Return to the disadvantaged child-question that there is nothing in his environment that "would mitigate against this child learning these hard core skills"

2.2.2.2 Schools as operationalization agent

2.2.2.2.1 Question of the use of behavioral objectives in structuring early intervention programs

        - 2.2.2.2.2 Segregation/Desegregation and its effects on learning
    - 2.2.2.3 Segregation/Integration
        - 2.2.2.3.1 View that certain educational objectives can only be achieved in heterogeneous racial groups
        - 2.2.2.3.2 Question of the "placement" of education in an integrated societ
        - 2.2.2.3.3 Education must teach children to "work in the context of integration"
    - 2.2.2.4 Introduction to the question of the schools and the disadvantaged racial ethnic child
        - 2.2.2.4.1 Response to Aurbach point of Section D 2.1.5.3.3
        - 2.2.2.4.2 The schools "assault" these students of identity on the basis of their race and socio-economic status
            - 2.2.2.4.2.1 The schools "assault the identity of the child and force him into a stylistically hostile system of interpersonal relations"
            - 2.2.2.4.2.2 Coleman Report -- self-identity is most important variable in terms of scho achievement
            - 2.2.2.4.2.3 Panel member feels that children in an integrated school would have higher self-image

Synopsis

This section began, continuing discussion on the question of "relevancy" in the educational process of disadvantaged children. In response to Dr. Patouillet, a panel member made the point that some aspects of the school composition such as bells and periods remained outside the scope of disadvantaged children. In expanding this point, he related that, in reality, the question of "time" was similarly irrelevant.

After this introductory phase, however, the panel returned to the area opened by Dr. Aurbach in Section B, the question of environmental influences and their effect on education. The program chairman initiat the discussion, relating that a paucity of information on the issue of environmental influences on educational achievement does exist and expanded his view, stating that the educational system needs to be reoriented towards early intervention for four year old children, than at age six as is now done. Mr. Moore related that a cessation of "pigeon holing" all children -- disadvantaged and not -- needs to be accomplished. The point was then made that in addition to the unrealistic nature of the pigeon holing, the categories, socio-economic classes were similarly circumspect. The discussion then touched on the questio of the interface of social science and educational research procedures and suppositions. The feeling expressed by Mr. Moore and agreed upon by some panel members was that this dualism was an attempt to "transpos one stylistic system on another stylistic system".

The panel focus then changed to a more global discussion of education, not only as education but as education "towards a life style". Dr. Aurbach then related that his bias was indeed towards a pedagogy related to "teaching the 3 R's". He did, however, agree with the previous speaker in relating that early intervention is, he feels, necessary. In supporting this view, he related that "there is nothing to be found in the child's environment that would mitigate against this child learning these hard core skills". Schools were then discussed as the agent to operationalize such an early intervention program and such aspects as behavioral objectives were discussed as methods of initiating and structuring such an endeavor.

At this point, the discussion changed directly to the issue of segregation/integration within the schools. Discussed was the influence of such policies on the learning of all children involved. The view was then posited that certain educational objectives (although unspecified) can only be achieved in heterogeneous groupings, and that the function of education must be to educate children to "work within the context of integration". The discussion then led to an in-depth analysis of the individual child in the schools. The gist of the response was in relation to Dr. Aurbach's initial supposition -- a lull in the reexamination of the environmental/school conflict paradigm. This point was then followed through the question of the "self-identity" of the child, and the effects the schools have on this aspect of the personality. The suppostion was made then, that the schools "(are an) assault on the identity of the child and force him into a stylistically hostile system of interpersonal relations". This comment was followed in an investigation of the effect of self-identity on children in schools, citing the effect of the Colemen Report, followed by the beginning of a discussion on the differentiation of socio-economic and racially/ethnic disadvantagement; however, the session ended prior to any substantive analysis of the issue.

Reaction

Section C was, for the most part, a combination of the questions addressed in Section B.

In-depth analysis of the position of the schools in relation to the disadvantaged child was discussed along with the environmental factors and educational achievement, early intervention to aid disadvantaged children, segregation/integration (audits global effects), "pigeon-holing" children, and the beginning of a discussion of teaching methods and pupil achievement.

The sensorium is developing, at this point, into both a cohesive panel and a somewhat bifurcated one. The cohesion is to be found in the "sharing" and "group efforts" utilized by panel members; however, the bifurcation developing is to be seen in the polar (to the rest of the panel) views expressed by Dr. Aurbach. The sensorium is still at a point of "shotgunning" in relation to the basic issues and has yet to resolve/synthesize the viewpoints of Dr. Aurbach, although they are being treated as substantive and of import by other panel members.

SECTION D

Typescript Outline

1.0 Dr. Singh

1.1 Explanation of "multi-phasic sensorium" title

1.2 Introduction to methodologies to be employed in sensorium

1.3 Introduction to program schedule

2.0 Initiation of discussion of "disadvantagement"

2.1 "Disadvantagement" as self-fulfilling prophecy

2.2 "Disadvantagement" as classification of types of students

2.3 Dr. Aurbach

2.3.1 Point that disadvantaged is an inappropriate term

2.3.1.1 Disadvantaged posits superiority/inferiority of different cultures

2.3.1.2 Understanding the phenomenon as "culturally different" a must

2.3.1.2.1 Differences are not necessarily disadvantages

2.3.1.2.2 Focus should be on differences

2.3.1.2.3 Differences may indeed be adaptive as in ghetto youths' "survival-adaption" behavior

2.3.1.3 Education must build on student strengths -- not weaknesses

2.3.1.3.1 Question of linguistic differences in advantaged/disadvantaged children

2.3.1.3.2 Anecdote of failings of IQ tests to measure true intelligence

2.3.1.3.3 IQ as a "cultural artifact"

2.3.1.4 Disadvantagement -- the term

2.3.1.4.1 Term is to be seen as "too damned global for anything"

2.3.1.4.2 Term is also "misleading" in connotations such as "money" and "parent"

2.3.1.4.3 Term is unspecified -- "everyone is disadvantaged in some sense"

2.3.1.5 Dr. Singh

2.3.1.5.1 Anecdote about the GRE test as a measure of "not of the type of person an individual is, or what he can offer, or what type of imagination he might have as a person, but rather it measures more something of a socially desirable factor"

2.3.1.5.2 "Tests were not testing 'Me' but more so 'I' aspect of individuality"

2.4 Language and disadvantagement

2.4.1 Introduction to question of language arts and disadvantaged children

2.4.1.1 Such students must learn "Standard English"

2.4.1.2 Anecdote of comparison of English to ghetto child to French to middle class child

2.4.1.3 Schools do not allow students to develop within their "own language structure"

2.4.1.3.1 Children need to express themselves verbally, in their own way

2.5 Continuation of discussion on disadvantagement

2.5.1 Students must "do their own thing", yet it must be a means to an end

2.5.2 Schools should not be in a position of change inculcation agents and values teachers

2.5.3 Panel member posits question of "relativity" in the question of disadvantagement

2.5.3.1 Schools, by definition, do not function to allow students to "do their own thing"

2.5.3.2 School systems do not accept differing cultures of children and there the school "turn them off"

2.5.3.2.1 Communication with these students is not possible if supposition is that whatever is learned by them in past is wrong

2.5.3.2.2 Anecdote of Indian schools and how this sequence develops

2.5.4 Dr. Patouillet

2.5.4.1 Introduction to position of counselor in th schools. Counselors must take eclectic approaches.

2.5.4.2 Question of the approach of the counselor in relation to the administration and the students

2.5.4.3 Position of guidance in relation to social change

2.5.4.3.1 Guidance as change agent of the school in a social system

2.5.4.3.2 "Interaction pattern" in guidanc an objective analysis of movements in a school

2.5.4.4 Anecdote of seeing "Tobacco Road"

Synopsis

This section began at the opening of one of the sessions of the multi-phasic sensorium. Dr. Singh was the initial speaker, recountin the genesis of the "multi-phasic sensorium" title ("sensorium" was conceived here as an opening of thoughts and perceptions). It was stressed that the sensorium might branch out somehow and possibly generate cross-cultural studies. Explore the possibilities of conducting such an interdisciplinary sensorium in different cultural context on a universal topic such as disadvantaged. Since the word disadvantaged has several forms of meaning culminating into the problems related to "environmental caging" effect are all in different ways, i would be interesting to conduct research and compare the universals among disciplines (Sociology, Psychology, Pedagogy, etc.) regardless of sub-cultural effects.

A short exposition on the methodologies to be employed in the sensorium was described followed by a free discussion and the issue of disadvantagement again came to the forefront.

Dr. Fagan then initiated the discussion of disadvantagement, positing the view that the term is indeed relative, in the sense that the term is amenable to a great latitude of personal interpretation. It was followed by the statement that "disadvantagement" may be construed as a self-fulfilling prophecy: ". . .but the classification itself, as several of you know has caused some problems in that it gets teachers to treat kids as though they were disadvantaged." Dr. Fagan continued, stating that the term is indeed inappropriate, and that he, personally, would prefer the term "disaffected", as the term "may be applied to all kids".

The conversation then refocused on Dr. Aurbach. Agreeing with the rest of the panel, he posited that "disadvantagement" and "cultural deprivation" were both "unfortunate" terms. Following in the "relativistic" dimension manifested in his previous statements, he then posite that disadvantagement, by definition, presupposes a superiority/inferiority dichotomy when employed in cultural comparisons. He stated that "differences" seen among cultures were not necessarily "disadvantaged" and that, in education, "we focus on differences". In the use of adaptive behaviors of ghetto children, these differences may be quite "adaptive" in nature. Following this view, Aurbach related that education must build in student "strengths, not weaknesses" as he feels education has classically done. This view was followed by another panel member who posited that "the IQ tests do not measure intelligence and that the IQ is to be seen as a cultural artifact". Following in this discussion of testing/relevancy, Dr. Singh related an anecdote of a personal experience with the GRE examination, and his feeling that the test did not measure "personal self" or "imagination or what an individual might have to offer."

The panel then changed focus slightly to the discussion of "language and the disadvantaged child". Dr. Aurbach initiated the discussion stating that "such students (disadvantaged) must learn Standard English". Dr. Patouillet, then in relating his view, posited the analogy that the learning of English for a disadvantaged child is the same as a middle class child learning French. A panel member, following Patouillet's lead stated that schools do not "allow students to develop their own language structure." Confronting the question of "non-verbalness" of disadvantaged children, a panel member related that these students were indeed verbal; albeit their communication was "different" and that they are only "non-verbal in the language we (the schools) impose on them."

Following the question of language, the panel returned to the question of disadvantagement and the schools. This area was opened up by Dr. Fagan who related that he felt that schools should allow students to "do their own thing", yet it should be within the genre of a "means to an end". Although unstated, it can be inferred that this "end" is to be understood as learning as in the "3 R's". Responding to the question of the schools, Dr. Fagan then related that "school systems that do not accept children of differing cultures tend to turn them (kids) off". He followed, with the interesting point that the schools, as acculturation agents, cannot "communicate with these students if we tell them everything they have learned in the past is wrong".

Near the conclusion of this section, Dr. Patouillet introduced his views of the postion of the counselor within the schools and in relation to the disadvantaged student. The major point he made was that through his "interaction model" guidance was to be seen as a "social change agent". This was not commented on, and the session closed as Mr. Caldwell began speaking.

Reaction

In Section D, the panel continued in its analysis of "disadvantagement"; major emphasis being placed on the reaction of the schools to disadvantagement and the effects of such "labeling" on the student. Also discussed was disadvantagement as a "self-fulfilling" prophecy, the "unfortunate" connotation of the term, and the effects that this term has on the cultural composition of the schools. The panel, also within the question of disadvantagement, discussed the issue of languag as used in the schools.

Many interesting and mordant points were made by the panel in this discussion. The emphasis does indeed seem to be changing and focusing directly on the disadvantaged child, the child *in* the school. Also, and importantly, many of the "myths" of disadvantagement are being categorically investigated and dismissed by the panel as *ad hominem* or simply erroneous. Included among these issues was the IQ question, the "non-verbalness" of disadvantaged children and the apotheosizing of "Standard English" within the public schools.

This was a particularly productive session; many insightful statements were made and the focus of the sensorium has continued its emphasis on the substantive issues of disadvantagement.

SECTION E

Typescript Outline

1.0 Mr. Caldwell

1.1 Anecdotes about his personal background in education in a rural Georgia community

1.1.1 High incidence of school drop-outs

1.1.2 Bifurcation of status in relation to academic/vocational courses

1.1.2.1 Question of the contemporary value that places academic endeavors as a social mobility/status device

1.1.3 Disadvantaged children

1.1.3.1 Opinion that some children may be made disadvantaged by 1.1.2.1

1.1.3.1.1 "Maybe some of the disadvantaged people are being made disadvantaged by the educational process-by the great emphasis on the liberal arts side of it, we'll say or the higher sciences side of education rather than the practical workshop type of knowledge."

2.0 Dr. Dwyer

2.1 Introduction to his interest -- the young disadvantaged chil

2.1.1 Opinion that, for the first time, "American educators are teaching young children a job previously done by the parents."

2.1.2 Parents have previously inculcated social skills.

2.1.3 Observation that middle class children are inculcated into academia early, at home, whereas disadvantaged children are not.

2.1.3.1 "Lower class kids are less ready to be (educationally) coerced."

2.1.3.1.1 Opinion that lower class children by this resistance to coercion can be said to "have more integrity."

2.1.3.1.2 Child resists irrelevant learning as ego defense.

2.1.3.2 Reorientation of teaching methodologies in relation to these children

2.1.3.2.1 School must be made "meaningful" in the sense of "interface" for these children.

2.1.3.2.2 Opinion that styles of teaching need to be developed that make reading and math "meaningful"

2.1.3.2.3 Current teaching methodologies do not allow children the "choice of learning."

3.0 Dr. Patouillet

3.1 Call for additional redefinition of the term "disadvantaged"

3.1.1 Question of whether best term is "disaffected" or "culturally disadvantaged."

3.1.2 Question of whether the "pluralistic society can succeed."

3.1.3 Question of individuality within a pluralistic society

4.0 Dr. Fagan

4.1 Question of individuality/disadvantaged/disaffected

4.1.1 Squire and Appleby study of English students -- strategy for approaching teaching English students was non-formal, with options left open to the student.

4.1.2 Feeling of presumptiousness of teacher to attempt to change students

4.1.3 Opinion that the sensorium may be searching for one word due to time constraints

4.1.4 Return to the view that academics are the "common denominator" of the school

4.1.5 View that the sensorium cannot hope to do an adequate "job" on the child at home and must, therefore, refocus on the school

4.1.5.1 School may foster disadvantagement by curriculum policies.

5.0 The school and the disadvantaged child

5.1 Panel member makes observation that reinvestigation of the who and where of disadvantagement is necessary.

5.2 Question of "power" in the schools in relation to the disadvantaged

5.2.1 Power should be "fostered", not given.

5.2.1.1 Some group consensus on this issue

5.2.2 Panel member feels that power is a term needing redefinition.

5.3 Panel member posits question of "curricular relevancy" in the schools.

5.3.1 Focus might be on some ways to engage them in something that turns children on.

5.3.2 Panel member posits that methods ought to be explored of getting kids involved in something that is "real" and also focus on societal survival behaviors.

5.3.3 Head Start is discussed as method of achieving 5.3.1 and 5.3.2

6.0 Dr. Tuttle

6.1 Comparison of American/European schooling methodologies

6.2 Introduction to the concept of the breakdown of community

6.2.1 Due to the breakdown of community the school has become a socialization agent for disadvantaged.

6.2.2 "Function of public education is to develop common perceptions and values so that people can live together in an interdependent society."

6.2.2.1 Question of "tracking" in the schools as de facto socio-economic segregation. It is a view that tracking has created schools weighted with lower socio-economic children.

6.2.3 Question of whether the school should be in the "business" of "trying to develop these common values and perceptions."

6.2.3.1 Question of the "relevancy" in relation to academic areas and curriculum

        - 6.2.3.2 Point that 85% of students do not go to college and 15% do: and the view that the 85% do not receive adequate vocational preparation
        - 6.2.3.3 Panel member makes the point that "academics is not the problem. It is the way we teach it."
            - 6.2.3.3.1 Question of teaching methodology effectiveness that produces 70% of students below norms.
            - 6.2.3.3.2 Question of interrelationship of academic/vocational education
            - 6.2.3.3.3 Question of social/intellectual perceptions of vocational/educational bifurcation

7.0 Dr. Patouillet

- 7.1 Reinitiation of the question of the relevancy of terms disadvantaged/advantaged
- 7.2 Question of the "plight of the black man."
- 7.3 Call to refocus on "disadvantagement and its influence on educational programs."
    - 7.3.1 Position statement that many blacks with high school degrees were unprepared for employment
    - 7.3.2 Position statement that the most numerical majority of disadvantaged individuals are Caucasian.
        - 7.3.2.1 Panel member's perception that there is little distinction in black/white disadvantaged
            - 7.3.2.1.1 Problems of these groups in "economics, social, jobs, schools are similar."
- 7.4 Development of generic, non-racially oriented perception of disadvantagement

Synopsis

Mr. Caldwell, the novelist, began with offering some personal anecdotes from his educational experiences in rural Georgia. He reemphasized his point related to the lack of "relevancy" in schooling and elaborated, citing the reason that made one of his friends drop out. His friend told him, "I want to learn agricultural sciences and here I am told to read Latin and told to do arithmetic and told to study English etc. And I don't mind doing that; but I'm going to be a farmer. I might want to be a dairy farmer in particular," he sai "And I want to know something about the science of agriculture and they won't teach it to me, and there is no way for me to learn it and I'm getting impatient." He said, "And if I go through this and then go off to college I'll want to go to an agricultural college." And he said, "The professors sort of look down upon the agricultural college. They think it's a secondary type of education, and they don think too much of that type of education -- agricultural education." So he said, "I just got discouraged and I've gone out and learned it on my own." He also addressed the issue of the high incidence of drop-outs in his area and the distinct curricular bifurcation into academic and vocational areas. On the question of disadvantaged children, he stated that the educational process may facilitate disadvantagement by its "great emphasis on the liberal arts side of it . . ., rather than on the practical workshop type of knowledge."

The conversation then turned to Dr. Dwyer, who introduced his interest as being "education of the young child," and recounted the contemporary reemphasis occurring within this field. His perception was, that "for the first time, American educators are teaching children skills previously taught by their parents." He followed, relating that disadvantaged children, unlike middle class children, were not inculcated academic achievement (unspecified) values by their parents. Therefore, within the schools, he stated that "lower class children are less ready to be coerced." After questioning, he stated his perception of education "coercion," that activity whereby a dominant group attempts to inculcate its values on another group. Stating that the disadvantaged child is 'less amenable" to such coercion, he posited that this child "resists irrelevant learning." **He** further stated that the school must achieve some degree of interface with these children's home lives if learning is to be facilitated. Recounting the view that current teaching methodologies are delimited with respect to "learning choice", he called for the investigation of various teaching styles designed to make subjects such as reading and mathematics "more meaningful."

The panel then refocused on Dr. Patouillet, who posed three additional questions on the subject of disadvantagement. These questions were: 1) Could a term be found to adequately describe what the panel had been calling "disadvantaged"; 2) Could the pluralistic society the advantaged/disadvantaged schism has created "succeed", and 3) What is the position of "individuality in a pluralistic society."

Dr. Fagan, following this thread of "individuality and disadvantagement", cited the Squire and Appleby studies in England. He stated, that in these studies, the strategy for "approaching teaching was nonformal, with options left open to the student." Dr. Fagan then related an additional perception: "that, to do an adequate job in the question of disadvantagement, the panel must function within a delimited scope: namely "the child within the school." He related "it seems to me that we are interested in what happens in the school . . .and what happens to make the child disadvantaged."

The panel then, in following Dr. Fagan's lead, began an investigation into the position of the disadvantaged child within the school.

Within the study of the schools, a panel member posited that the question of curricular "relevancy" was of great importance in teaching the disadvantaged child.

The sensorium then focused on Dr. Tuttle. In addressing the question of disadvantagement, Dr. Tuttle took a sociological perspective, utilizing his perception of "community" and its relation to the schools. He seemingly took an underlying supposition that, within American society, the breakdown of "community" has coerced the schools into the position of a socialization agent for the disadvantaged child He continued, relating that the "function of public education is to develop common perceptions and values so that people can live together in an interdependent society." Expounding his point of view within th topic of the schools and curricular organizational methodologies, he related that such aspect as the "tracking" method has produced the sequel of a *de facto* segregation along socio-economic/racial guidelines. A panel member in response to the suppostion, then questioned the position of the school as an aculteration agent. Referring specifically to the business of education, he questioned whether the major emphasis should be placed on academic courses when only "15% of students go on to college." A panel member related that by this misalignment of emphasis, many students, notably the disadvantaged "do not receive adequate vocational preparation." The point of vocational education was, however, quickly challenged by another panel member who took a polar view that "academics are not the problem. . . it is the manner in which we teach it." In substantiating his position, he related that teaching methodologies could be considered circumspect when they produce "70% of students below grade norms."

The discussion then refocused on Dr. Patouillet. He again requestioned the terms "disadvantaged" and "advantaged". Also, he emphasized the "plight of the black man", and called on an investigation of disadvantagement and its effect on educational programs. Another panel member related that within the broad heading of "disadvantagement", little distinction was to be found on racial guidelines. This member further related, that, within broad areas of economies, the social milieu, jobs, and schools, disadvantaged groups exhibited great similarity. This comment then initiated the genesis of a new, more generic conceptualization of the term disadvantaged.

Reaction

Section E was a somewhat uneven section. It did, however, cover a great deal of ground. At this point, the sensorium has seemingly focused on the issue of disadvantagement, and delimited the area to the "what" and "who" aspects. Within the "who", especially, many insights were made by panel members. The point of "who" was discussed at several levels in the schools, as an individual and as more generic, general grouping than had previously been developed.

The sensorium, at this point, is growing more cohesive both in insights/statements by panel members and by the additive effects of group interaction and in achieving consensus on a more delimited topic area than previously achieved.

An additional area discussed, and quite succinctly, by Dr. Tuttle was "school/community interaction". Through the supposition of the decline of "community", Dr. Tuttle related that the schools now function as a dominant acculturation agent for children, children who do not have the advantage of academically oriented home lives as enjoyed by middle class students. This was, I feel, a major contribution to the sensorium as it focused attention on the schools as both a societal simulacrum and as a puissant acculturation agent.

A final area discussed was the position of the schools in relation to "client's" needs. A panel member related that, although 85% of students do not go to college, the institution remains somewhat oriented towards these individuals. However, this issue was not explored in depth.

At this juncture, however, the sensorium is developing additional and quite substantive insights into the disadvantaged child, and is in the process of categorically dismissing many of the shibboleths generally held.

SECTION F

Typescript Outline

- 1.0 The disadvantaged individual
  - 1.1 Panel member questions whether to substitute terms such as "successful" or "unsuccessful"
    - 1.1.1 Also, need to develop a perception that is devoid of "urban" or "country" delimitations
    - 1.1.2 Agreement by another panel member that great similarity exists among the disadvantaged
    - 1.1.3 Panel member questions the stereotyping of the black American
      - 1.1.3.1 Question of the visual identification of the black
- 2.0 Segregation/Integration
  - 2.1 Panel member relates perceptions about the segregated school
  - 2.2 The same panel member relates that segregated schools are taught by "outside" teachers who lack understanding of the child in question.
  - 2.3 Initiation of discussion of classroom environment and disadvantaged childrens' learning in segregated schools
    - 2.3.1 Educators and social scientists must reexamine school in which "kids have been successful".
    - 2.3.2 Initiation of discussion of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act
    - 2.3.3 Reemphasis of lack of relevancy in education for disadvantaged children
    - 2.3.4 Question of socio-economic and housing factors behind disadvantagement
      - 2.3.4.1 Perception of panel member that this aspect needs to be minimized
    - 2.3.5 Question of growth/development of children in relatio to classroom instruction
      - 2.3.5.1 Discussion of impact of "Sesame Street"
      - 2.3.5.2 Discussion of wider impact of television on children

2.3.5.2.1 View that teachers might learn from methodologies employed in commercials

2.3.5.2.2 Development of tracking methods that "build on the familiar"

2.3.5.2.3 Question of interest span in children

  2.3.5.2.3.1 Discussion of interest span as related to "sensory bombardment"

2.3.5.2.4 Television as "brainwashing"

Synopsis

Section F was a short, somewhat disjunctured session concentratin on several areas previously discussed.

The session began with reflections relating an additional aspect of the term disadvantaged: that, societally speaking, "disadvantagement" may be synonymous with "successful" or "unsuccessful". Furthermore, it was also suggested that in developing a working definition of disadvantagement, the term must be devoid of delimiting terms such as "urban or rural". Disadvantagement perhaps should be studied as general factors affecting all human beings. This was followed by another remark, as discussed in Section E, that, in studying the disadvantaged, we find more common traits (homogeneity). However, there are certain aspects exclusive to certain races such as black is black and disadvantaged. The concept of homogeneity was then expanded through an investigation of the black American, who is normally felt to be "disadvantaged". Within the discussion of the black, the concept of visual impact was also mentioned, although not in depth. Dr. Singh brought a point that perhaps conditions creating disadvanta in the form of learning and behavior needs to be the focal point of study. Regardless of racial background, certain stylistic features can be observed under specific conditions.

The sensorium discussed the issue of segregation/integration within the schools. The initial speaker related that black segregated schools were largest numerically; however, that American Indian schools were the most "tightly" segregated. Continuing, he then related, that in studies completed, students in racially heterogeneous grouping exhibit proclivity to higher achievement. However, he also stated that the teachers in these schools, if not actual members of the dominant racial group, had been inculcated into the ethos of this group. It was further felt that both disadvantagement and classroom atmosphere warranted any consideration in the examination of such schools. The feeling of this speaker was that, to better serve the disadvantaged population, we must reexamine "successful" schools and students in an attempt to emulate their methods.

The next topic discussed was the Title I aspect of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It was the felt belief of the speaker that this act did much to foster disadvantagement in the schools through "labeling" as discussed in Section A. Focus then shifted abruptly to a question of "relevancy" of educational tasks and teaching methodologies and the socio-economic backgrounds of disadvantaged children. The feeling of the speaker was that, within this area, the categorizing of children by socio-economic status and housing area and type must be minimized.

The concluding area discussed in this section was an interesting one: the question of the growth/development of children in relation to differing classroom and instructional methodologies. This discussion, through a group member's contribution quickly expanded into a discussion of the impact of television on children and especially on the program "Sesame Street". Anecdotes as to the genesis of this, then nascent program, were discussed with the panel questioning whether it could be dismissed as "brainwashing" or "sensory bombardment". However, it was the feeling of several members that the methodologies employed, "building on the familiar" may have great impact within the classroom

Reaction

Section F was a short section that did, however, achieve some highly productive insights. Several new insights/topics were discussed The question of disadvantagement as economic "success vs. failure"; the question of segregated/integrated schools and the theory of label as "emulation" which was examined in depth.

"Emulation" developed within two aspects in this section. First, through a panel member who related that schools should study successful cases (teachers and schools) and "model" after them in an attempt to achieve greater "relevancy". Secondly, "emulation" took the form that the schools should look at other media devices, i.e. television for "cues" to assist them in reaching students. Both of these are new and quite mordant methodological perceptions in attempting to reach the disadvantaged child. As the session ended rather abruptly with the ending of the tape, the topic of television was not expanded.

Typescript Outline

1.0 "Dominance" theory in society

1.1 Discussion of above theory: wherein one group exerts influence over another

1.1.1 Discussion of such behavior in the classroom

1.1.1.1 Discussion of development of language materials designed for disadvantaged childre in the classroom

1.1.1.2 Opinion that such materials may break down the advantaged/disadvantaged dichotomy

1.1.1.2.1 "The language spoken by blacks is not inferior, but different."

1.1.1.2.2 Opinion that such dichotomy creat inferiority in students

1.1.2 Discussion of dichotomy of rich and poor

1.1.2.1 Recountation of historical bases of poverty

1.1.2.2 Opinion that early intervention programs should focus on "acceptance" by children of different groups

1.1.2.3 Opinion that the government is working with the poor adults and that the schools must work with the children, as it is through them that potential is expressed

1.1.2.4 Panel member calls for focus to be placed upon intervention programs for young children.

1.1.2.4.1 Above stated panel member (in 1.1.2.4) calls for return to statements of Dr. Tuttle.

1.1.2.4.1.1 Supposition based on the International Conference on Academic Achievement Grouping (1964): students do not exhibit achievement differences in eithe heterogeneous or homogeneous grouping

1.1.2.4.1.2 Singh: achievement differences are caused by "social contexts" rather than grouping per se.

1.1.2.4.2 Panel member in 1.1.2.4.1 calls for investigation of affective domain behaviors in classrooms.

1.1.2.4.2.1 "There is no such thing as a 'subject' in this electronic environment we presently operate in."

1.1.2.4.2.2 This panel member then returns to prio premise: "what can we do for kids acros the culture."

1.2 Theories of working with the disadvantaged child

1.2.1 Castigation of age groupings as methodology of reaching these children

1.2.1.1 Supposition that this methodology is still employed by the public schools

1.2.1.2 Question of "what is Head Start"

1.2.1.2.1 "What is the presupposition of Head Start"

1.2.1.2.1.1 Panel member relates that it is an early intervention program

1.2.1.2.2 Panel member relates opinion: that idea of "bringing disadvantaged kids up to middle class standards is erroneous.

1.2.1.2.3 Panel member relates the failure of Head Start programs to maintain academic gains over longitudinal studies.

1.2.1.2.4 Learning and Research Development Center, University of Pittsburg

1.2.1.2.4.1 Statement that this program is an enrich ment program for junior high and high school children

1.2.1.2.5 Panel member relates that "we ought to focus on the system of education and what it does to people."

1.2.1.2.5.1 Panel member calls for investigation into learning theorists who have related learning to growth stages a la Bloom/Hunt.

1.2.1.2.5.2 Panel member also calls for investigation into all learning theories.

1.2.1.2.5.3 Panel member relate anecdote of the Wax study in the Pine Ridge Indian Community where teacher/educational system rejection led to drop-outs.

1.2.1.2.5.3.1 Panel member relates this to the "integrity" discussed previousl

1.2.1.2.5.3.2 Agreement by an additional panel member on 1.2.1.2.5.3.1

1.2.1.2.5.3.3 Supposition that this was caused by delimited 3 "R's" conception of learning

1.2.1.2.5.4 Function of the teacher as acculturation agent

1.2.1.2.5.5 Return to question of the failure of the Head Start programs

1.2.1.2.5.6 Sequence of Head Start and other programs is discussed.

1.2.1.2.5.6.1 Question of maintaining cultures

1.2.1.2.5.6.2 Panel member relates that culture is not learned as no culture "mitigates against reading or mathematics

1.2.1.2.5.6.3 Panel member in support of member relating 1.2.1.2.5.6.2 states that "there is somethin lousy happening in the school and it probably has to do with the affront o the identities of kids."

1.3 Theoretical conceptions of education

- 1.3.1 Panel member relates that emphasis must be placed on education as a "total process that starts when the children are in Head Start and goes on through the time they are in college."
    - 1.3.1.1 Schools must "begin doing something at every level or Head Start gains will be lost."
- 1.3.2 Baldwin Whitehall School and I.P.T. Programs
    - 1.3.2.1 Study in which new curriculum was employed within parameters of an existent school
- 1.3.3 Call for the schools as a "learning environment"
    - 1.3.3.1 Supposition that this environment will be philosophically as opposed to psychologically based
    - 1.3.3.2 Call for a reevaluation of teacher/principal relationship
    - 1.3.3.3 Question of the "insensitivity" of the teacher to the students and other educational personnel, which is seen as "not conducive to learning"

Section G centered around the questions raised in Section D; the schools and the society and the effects of the components on the child.

Taking a sociological perspective, Dr. Singh initiated what can be called the "dominance theory" in sociology. Within the schools, one group "tends to exert influence over another"; and such behavior is frequently manifest in the classroom through the teacher. Following this lead, another panel member related that, although such a situation may exist, it may be minimized through materials specificall designed for the disadvantaged student. Recounting anthropological studies the point was then made that such materials have been used successfully in ghetto schools. On the question of language, a member stated: "The language spoken by blacks is not inferior, but different Dr. Patouillet followed, stating that such dichotomization coupled wit the predilection towards Standard English has created de facto segregation and inferior status for disadvantaged children.

The sensorium, following this question of "dominance", then focused on the economic "rich/poor" bifurcation.

The panel then turned to the question of early intervention and Head Start programs, with Dr. Singh stating that such programs "must focus on acceptance of children of differing socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds". "Acceptance", in this case, is to be construed as "acceptance beyond the tolerance level". The consensus of the panel on this issue was that within the sensorium, focus must remain on the schools; as through them exposure to the child is maximized. The pane then abruptly readdressed the issue of curriculum, when a member directed attention towards the previous comments of Dr. Tuttle (Section F)

This member gave evidence that within the curricular constructs, heterogeneous groupings "do not affect student achievement". In support of this, a second member cited the findings of the Internationa Conference on Academic Achievement Grouping, which was held in 1964.

After the discussion of curriculum, Dr. Fagan introduced the issue of affective learnings and opportunitites within the schools. Taking a McLuhan-oriented stance, he related: "There is no such thing as 'subject' in this electronic age we live in". Discussion on the position of the schools then led to further probing of curriculum areas such as "grouping" and Head Start. The Head Start question was pursued vigorously by the panel. This instigation was initiated by a panel member who asked "What is Head Start?" Head Start is an early intervention program. The feeling of the panel was that, however, the concept of bringing kids up to middle class standards is erroneous.

Following this discussion of Head Start, the sensorium focused on the position of the child in relation to the schools. "We ought to focus on the system of education and what it does to people." Within the study of the schools, two panel members questioned learning theory epistemology and its effect on pupils' personalities. Following this, a rather incisive point was made that, in the Wax study of Pine Ridge Indian Community, teacher aptitudes were shown to produce the sequela of expressive student attrition. Recounting the genesis of the phenomenon, a panel member related a two-fold causation: a curriculum suffering from the structure of a 3 R's delimitation and the position of the teacher as a "dominant society" acculturation agent. However, this point was quickly challenged by another member who stated that, although some teacher rejection might exist, "cultural bias" could not be held causative or catalytic as "no culture mitigates against readin or mathematics." However, this member did relate that school is to a great degree an affront to the personalities of many children.

The final topic discussed in this session was the view that the schooling process cannot be understood as isolated, but longitudinal, and must be considered as a "total process that starts when the child enters the Head Start program and goes on through the time they are in college." At the close of the session a panel member called for the investigation of the schools as a "learning environment", an environment that must be philosophically, as opposed to psychologically, oriented. However, this session closed before this point could be examined.

Reaction

Section G was a highly productive session. At this point in time, the sensorium has delimited its focus to the disadvantaged child and his/her position within the schools and society. Although the range of comments/suppositions is still wide, the common denominators are the disadvantaged child and social context.

As the aforementioned topic delimitation is almost complete, this session concentrated on the society and schools and their position in working with this particular child. Major points discussed were the "dominance" theory and an in-depth investigation of the Head Start programs as they have been utilized in assisting the disadvantaged child. Consensus was achieved on both issues. Panel members agreed that "dominance" is an impediment to the disadvantaged and that, as a methodology, Head Start has been ineffective.

SECTION H

Typescript Outline

1.0 Change within the schools via de jure structures

  1.1 Explanation of school boards and individuals who serve on them

  1.2 Panel member posits the view that, as systems, schools are institutions not amenable to change.

    1.2.1 Panel member continues relating the hierarchical nature of the schools, administration and the school board

2.0 Dr. Patouillet

  2.1 Return to the REAP methodology of learning -- anecdote that in his office he does not have any books

    2.1.1 Feeling that despite lack of written communication, i.e. term papers, his students "know the theories of counseling."

    2.1.2 Opinion that his methodologies, which are operational at graduate school level are amenable to the elementary school

3.0 Institutions/institutionalized behavior

  3.1 Self-perpetuation of the institution

    3.1.1 Entropy within institutional systems due to "impounderables and impermeable barriers" that produce power flows but no communication

  3.2 Anecdote of theory of using "chits" to allow students to "buy" their education

  3.3 Feeling of one panel member that schools are a "monopoly"

  3.4 Performance contracting

    3.4.1 Panel member relates that this has been done in Texas

    3.4.2 Definition of performance based payment

      3.4.2.1 Refutation of this concept by Dr. Aurbach due to lack of long lasting results

  3.5 Alternative communicative methods

3.5.1 View that child is more "open" and therefore has alternative methods of communicating

3.5.2 Panel member calls for the investigation of alternatives to reading and mathematics as communicative methods.

Synopsis

It was a fairly short session that began with a study of the position of the schools in relation to their finding school boards. Also within the study of school boards, the "types" of individuals, i.e. professionals and educated citizenry, who serve on them were discussed. The school board was discussed as a functioning institution; and as such, was not felt to be amenable to rapid change. Change, within this structure, was felt to be a "vicious cycle."

The sensorium then refocused on the issue of communication; the initial speaker being Dr. Patouillet. On the subject of communication, he posited that it can be enhanced through implementation of varied methodologies. Continuing along the guidelines of the REAP developed in earlier sessions, Patouillet stated that in courses he had taught, "I've gotten pieces of music, art, etc." as course requirements, yet my students "do know the theories of counseling". Relating that such methods have been successful in graduate school, he posited that such methods should warrant investigation within the elementary schools also

A panel member then abruptly refocused on the schools as systems/institutions. The schools, for this panel member were to be seen as "self-perpetuating" institutions that, due to "impounderables and impermeable boundaries" produce "power flows, but no communication." Another member in an attempt to focus on the issue of "performance", related the experiments of "performance contracting and the "chit" or token systems as employed in a Texas experiment.

The session closed on the question of alternative communication methods, previously introduced by Dr. Patouillet. Following this lead, a member related that, as children are to be seen as more "open" they may also be considered more "amenable" to alternative communication methods.

Reaction

Section H was a short, productive session

The focus in this session was on the schools as an institution, an institution that was perceived as almost monolithic in nature. The panel related its view that, as large institutions, schools/school boards are not amenable either to change or communication.

Following in the trend of communication, Dr. Patouillet and several other members called for alternative communication methods a la REAP, although specific methods and/or their operationalization were not analyzed in depth.

At this point, the sensorium can be seen as having achieved consensus on the child and is now undertaking the study of school dynamics.

Typescript Outline

1.0 Outline of topics to be discussed: presented by Dr. Singh

1.1 Dwyer tape of environmental academics tape for disadvantaged children

1.2 Exploration in depth of topics discussed in previous day

1.3 Exploration of linguistic principles as related to the disadvantaged child

1.4 Exploration of question of parental/community involvement in the schools

2.0 Dr. Dwyer

2.1 Teaching styles

2.1.1 Introduction of "hard core" teaching,teaching in whic the child learns words within the "appropriate contex

2.1.1.1 This is essentially a "trial and error" method.

2.1.2 Narration of tape showing methods of teaching 2.1.1 perspective, emphasizing socialization aspects of this methodology

2.1.2.1 Discussion as to reaction of children to filming of the tape

2.1.2.2 Statement as to usage of this method in four Head Start programs

2.1.2.3 Statement that within this program children are encouraged to interact with the teacher

2.1.2.4 Objective of the program: "to help kids get a real running head start at academics so th their attitude is one that perceives academic as very functional."

2.1.2.4.1 Attempt to create academic relevance through "functional usage of reading and math."

2.1.2.4.2 Question of using this technique with four as opposed to five year olds

2.1.2.4.3 Question of word differentiation

2.1.2.5 Panel member relates similar program using mechanical device to show children pictures to check vocabulary.

2.1.2.6 Panel member who had done similar work relat that his emphasis was upon "not teaching, but to have them pick up words in their environment that were important."

2.1.2.7 Return to panel member stating objective in 2.1.2.4

  2.1.2.7.1 This panel member is questioned a to his goal of "getting attention of educators."

2.1.3 Showing film

2.1.3.1 Question of curricular relevancy and typology of experiences that create this relevancy

  2.1.3.1.1 Question of usage of functional emphasis in classrooms, i.e. "face validity."

  2.1.3.1.2 Statement that our "culture is no yet entirely non-functional, and as such, functional emphasis coul be created."

    2.1.3.1.2.1 Question of "meaningfulness" within the curriculum, i.e.acts such as counting/ reading

    2.1.3.1.2.2 Question as to "meaningful" -- can it mean doing community work in the schools?

    2.1.3.1.2.3 Question of whether migrant children ca experience this sort of relevancy

2.1.3.2 Panel member calls for reinvestigation of student/teacher and school/society language differentiation.

  2.1.3.2.1 Question of the classroom as an "artificial environment"

2.1.3.2.2 Supposition that classroom needs to be made more natural and that more natural environment would facilitate learning

2.1.3.2.3 Panel member relates that while he agrees with this, emphasis on "written language" must be include

2.1.3.2.4 Panel member questions this concept in the light of the work done by O. K. Moore.

- 2.1.3.2.4.1 This work is questioned by another panel member who relates that Moore employed an intellectually superior group in his experiments.
- 2.1.3.2.4.2 Panel member relates his interest in the gaming aspect of Moore's work.
- 2.1.3.2.4.3 Panel member relates belief that reading/math/socialization must be within a social context.
- 2.1.3.2.4.4 Panel member (same as above) relates that above aspects must be "integrated" prior to usage in a social context.
- 2.1.3.2.4.5 Another member relate that filming children must take into accoun both the Hawthorne Effect and the Heisenberg Principle.

2.1.3.2.5 Panel member relates that written/spoken language is differentiated early in children's lives and that this bifurcation creates sequelae of inadequate school preparation. This panel member then called for "re-sequencing" of this aspect of learning environment.

2.1.3.2.6 Question of optimal starting age of children in school

- 2.1.3.2.6.1 Panel member relates that in some countri children do not star school until age seven.
- 2.1.3.2.6.2 Panel member relates that in the International Study of Educational Achievement optimal starting age was seen as six.
- 2.1.3.2.6.3 Panel member relates that in the Marian Goldberg reading project, starting age was unimportant.
  - 2.1.3.2.6.3.1 Panel member relates that Dr. Goldberg is replicating her experiments in Harle schools.
- 2.1.3.2.6.4 Dr. Passow relates experiment he conducted in DeWitt Clinton High School in New York: attemp was to overcome unde achievement in high school kids; results were simply that som children didn't work well with others.
- 2.1.3.2.6.5 Machler Study: "The Little Black Schoolhouse: or "Making it in the Ghetto School
  - 2.1.3.2.6.5.1 Position of this study in relation to Marti Deutsch early intervention work

Synopsis

The opening began with Dr. Singh recounting the major areas stated to be discussed during the day. These topics are:

1. An environmental academics tape for disadvantaged children was presented by Dr. Dwyer.
2. Exploration in depth of topics discussed in previous day.
3. Exploration of linguistic principles as it relates and reveals some of the realities and myths related to the general topic of disadvantagement.

Dialogue in this session was opened by Dr. Dwyer who related his conception of "hard core" teaching. The "hard core" teaching he feels emphasizes not only "words" but the social/environmental context within which they are expressed. Dr. Dwyer did, however, relate that methodologically, such a teaching technique was essentially "trial and error. To illustrate his approach, a videotape was shown explaining the teaching method he had posited. He further stated that he felt such teaching methodologies must emphasize the "socialization" aspects of teaching.

Both tape and the methodology it presented were then discussed by the panel. The panel related several viewpoints that such a methodology might be advantageously employed in Head Start programs, and th possible effect that filming might have had on the "representativeness of the children's behavior in the sequence. The program then discusse as to its objective: "to help kids get a real running head start at academics so that their attitude is one that perceives academics as functional." When questioned by another panel member, Dr. Dwyer relate that "functionality" is to be seen as essentially synonymous to "relevancy". The concept was then expanded into the linguistic field.

several comments were made relating these methods and their implementation in reading/vocabulary studies with children at age four. A panel member who had conducted a similar project, expressed the belief that, in this area, it was "not teaching, but to have them (the disadvantaged child) pick up words in their environment that were important.'

The focus then changed slightly to the question of the "typology" of experiences that create "relevancy" in the classroom. Following within the genre of "face validity", the point of utilization/maximization of "functional" aspects of the society within the classroom was proposed. Following in this "line" of meaningfulness, a panel member questioned the relevancy of acts such as counting and reading for the disadvantaged child. Also related was the question of whether "meaningful" can be interfaced with "relevancy" in the form of a school/community interface. This topic closed when a panel member then questioned the possibility of the utilization of this type of experience with migrant children who lacked a "sense of community".

The next topic discussed was an in-depth analysis of the student/teacher and school/community language differentiation. Centering on the question of the classroom as an "environment", the panel offered comments/suggestions aimed at making the classroom more "natural" as opposed to "artificial" as it now is. The supposition was that such a change would both facilitate and enhance learning. However, Dr. Aurbach countered, relating that, within the schools, emphasis must be primarily placed on "written language". This topic was then explored by a panel member using a new perspective as a construct operationalized by O. K. Moore through his use of the "talking typewriter" in working with young children. The work of Moore, called the "autoletic-responsive environment" was then discussed by the sensorium. However, a panel member questioned the work of Moore stating that the N employed by Moore was "unrepresentative by nature of an intellectually superior grouping". Another panel member related that, within Moore's work, a great amount of simulation/gaming practices were employed.

The panel then focused on the necessity of "integrating" aspects of reading/mathematics/socialization to achieve the apotheosized "relevancy". Taking a more general anthropological/sociological view, a panel member then posited that, within the disadvantaged child a written/spoken language bifurcation occurs early in the child's life and may be seen as causal/catalytic in the inadequacy" of these children's academic preparation. This view led to the question of "age sequencing" of children in schools. Age sequencing was discussed at several levels. that, in some countries, school intervention is earlier/later than in the U.S.; that, in the International Study of Educational Achievement, the optimal age was seen as six; and that, in the Marian Goldberg Reading Project, age was not found to be a significant variable. Directly relating this last study to the disadvantaged child, a panel member related that, at present, Dr. Goldberg is replicating this study with a disadvantaged group of Harlem children. Two additional studies were then cited: the DeWitt Clinton High School Study and the Machler studies. These were presented as analyses of early intervention and student relations within the schools however, as the session closed, many were not discussed in depth.

Reaction

This session initiated a new focus in the sensorium: methods to reach the disadvantaged child within the classroom structure. Within this study two areas, "curricular relevancy" and "language interface", predominated.

The area of "language interface" was quite important and represents a new direction developed by the sensorium. As previously noted, the sensorium has developed a "working" understanding of the disadvantaged child and is now in the process of integrating this understanding into a multi-faceted methodological perspective through which to serve the disadvantaged child. At this juncture panel consensus is on the school as a societal acculteration agent.

However, Dr. Aurbach has continued to maintain a more delimited posture in relation to the goals of education (to inculcate basic educational skills) and as such, he has remained distinctly polar, yet important.

SECTION J

Typescript Outline

1.0 Study of research/research methodologies

1.1 Panel member posits that, in all research, the difference in groups is small.

1.2 Change within the schools

1.2.1 Involvement of the parents as a community resource

1.2.2 Opinion that "schools cannot be structured for the disadvantaged . . .or anybody else."

1.2.2.1 Panel member posits that with the disadvantaged child, that the school has a doubly hard job, as the home environment is non-reinforcing.

1.2.2.2 Panel member posits that within the normal classroom, change cannot take place.

1.2.2.3 Panel member posits that new teaching method are fallacious (team teaching, individualize instruction, etc.)

1.2.2.3.1 Analysis by above panel member of teacher methods and learning

1.2.2.3.1.1 Question of "readine

1.2.2.3.1.2 Question of "style of learning"

1.2.2.3.1.3 Question of "peer relationships"

1.2.2.3.2 Supposition by panel member (who is followed from 1.2.2.1 on) that change in structure may change relationship.

1.2.2.3.2.1 Supposition that educators believe any change will be beneficial

1.2.2.3.2.2 Supposition that educators do not understand reasons for change

- 1.2.2.3.3 Reasons for change
    - 1.2.2.3.3.1 Change of relationship
    - 1.2.2.3.3.2 Creation of an environment
- 1.2.2.3.4 Concept of the ideal school and questioning of the what/who/how involved in construction
    - 1.2.2.3.4.1 Question of Orson Bean school
    - 1.2.2.3.4.2 Question of the Summerhill School
    - 1.2.2.3.4.3 Suppositions as to extreme age, sex groupings etc.
    - 1.2.2.3.4.4 Supposition that the panel look beyond organizational structures and examine social structures
- 1.2.2.3.5 Socialization as effecting the school environment
    - 1.2.2.3.5.1 Opinion that "home environment determines children's abilities to social ize in groups"
- 1.2.2.3.6 Question of motivation behind structural typology employed in the schools
    - 1.2.2.3.6.1 Panel member posits that in urban settings, schools do not "take advantage of environment.
    - 1.2.2.3.6.2 Question of "how do you capitalize on these environmental cues
    - 1.2.2.3.6.3 Panel member relate that we must examir total school envirc ment, the school ecology.

2.0 Question of poverty/wealth in relation to the schools

2.1 Supposition that poverty/wealth are both multi-faceted constructs

2.1.1 "We cannot generalize on the basis of poverty or wealth.

2.2 Return to the question of the "ideal school"

2.2.1 Supposition that within this type of school students must be "involved"

2.2.2 Supposition of varied materials and instructional methods

2.2.3 Usage of tutoring a la Big Brother

2.2.4 Involvement of the school within the community through the use of the community as a resource

2.2.5 Supposition that school created is teleological

2.3 Position of such a school within a larger school system

2.3.1 Question of teacher involvement

2.3.2 Question of teacher unions

2.3.3 Question of standards the school must adhere to

2.3.4 School organization

2.3.4.1 Homogeneous/hetereogenous groupings

2.3.4.2 Question of openness/flexibility as illustrated in Harlem Prep

2.3.4.3 Openness/flexibility "so that you can try different kinds of methods

2.3.5 School must recognize that with disparate groupings of teachers and students, individual values must be held.

2.3.6 Question of self-motivation and self-knowledge

Synopsis

Section J was a period of both accomplishment and change for the sensorium.

Facing the concept of "change" early in the session, the sensorium related, that, as a methodology of understanding change, "parental involvement" was necessary. A panel member, then "seconded" this view, within the perspective that the disadvantaged child did not have the advantage of an "academically oriented" or "reinforcing" home life. However, Dr. Aurbach then related that his feeling was that the normal classroom was far too constraining an environment to facilitate any form of change. He continued, stating his view that many of the new teaching methods such as team teaching were not aiding students and that "readiness" of learners and "style of learning" were aspects of the learning paradigm that must be considered.

Following this, a more philosophical questioning of change and structure was developed by another panel member. Within this, a panel member related his opinion, that "some educators will accept any chang as beneficial and that educators, in reality, do not "understand the reasons for change." This member then posited that change occurs as a "change of relationship" or as the "creation of a new environment."

The panel then focused on the creation of the "ideal school", wit members providing personal insights as to the form this might take. Several "modern schools" were discussed: Summerhill, The Orson Bean School and Harlem Prep. Within the study of these schools, a panel member related that an area for study within these schools should be "home environment factors that determined children's ability to socialize in groups". This led to a general discussion of the school and the perceived differentiation in urban/rural schools. The major question of the panel was "how can we maximize the environmental cues that each area (rural/urban) offers." It was also suggested that possibly, the most meaningful technique to employ is a re-examination of the "total school environment" or the "ecology" of the school.

The panel members then entered a "free association" discussion of what might determine an "ideal school". Many opinions were offered by the panel: that the ideal school must "involve" students; that instructional methodologies and materials must be varied; that the school must be "goal oriented" and that the school must be involved within the community. The position of such a school was then questioned as a sub-system to the larger "school system". Within this area, the school was questioned in relation to both teacher involvement and unions. Also questioned were the "standards" that the scho must adhere to. Within this discussion the position of Harlem Prep as an example of an "open" school was questioned and discussed.

At the close of the session, the subject of the school in relation to heterogeneity of student groupings was questioned, however, as the tape ended, the subject was not continued.

Reaction

Section J was possibly the most "interesting" session to date.

Within this section, the panel centered on the question of the schools, their structure and function and philosophical position within the milieu of American society. Also discussed was the concept of the ideal school, its composition and its relationship with its environment. Factors embodied in this school were many: the major ones being "openness", "relevancy", and "community interface".

Briefly touched on were several other issues: the position of the teacher, the types and consequences of change, and the home/ school dichotomy as it relates to attitudes facilitative of learnin in young disadvantaged children.

To date, this was the most cohesive and group-oriented session.

Typescript Outline

1.0 Question of viewing the child via direct interaction, tapes, films, etc.

  1.1 Panel member relates that, to view an individual "in his uniqueness, you begin to imagine him as a social isolate."

  1.2 Question of teacher and student choice

    1.2.1 "When teachers attempt to facilitate learning, they influence the student in a manner which may be "unnatural."

  1.3 Role of the teacher

    1.3.1 Role of the teacher in relation to change

    1.3.2 Panel member posits a supposition that teacher/student role differentiation is a heirarchical construct.

    1.3.3 Teacher as "expert" (unexplained)

    1.3.4 Question as to the "variable of the classroom" as influencing student/teacher relationships

    1.3.5 Teacher must realize that the classroom is an "enormously complex incomprehensible thing."

  1.4 Dr. Fred Gearing, anthropologist

    1.4.1 Supposition that "study' information may not be of use in the classroom

    1.4.2 Supposition that the classroom teacher is the most important individual within a class

    1.4.3 Supposition that all actions/studies must be judged whether or not they "help the teacher see what's going on in the classroom"

    1.4.4 Study of the concept of "role"

    1.4.5 Study of the individual's behavior within the matrix of all behavior

      1.4.5.1 Panel member calls for delimitation of concept of role as a "transaction" among people

2.0 Question of teacher development

  2.1 Supposition that time necessary to develop a good teacher is "three years".

2.2 Question of teacher/student interaction -- termed "we-they" language

2.3 Question of teacher/student communication as "you know-they know" theory

2.4 Question of the universal "we"

2.4.1 Explanation of the "we" as "an expression of the capacities for good and evil of the species"

2.5 Question of linguistics in teaching

2.5.1 Panel member calls for an investigation into a "coding to be used by teachers in examination of personal performance.

2.6 Question of application of 2.5 in English teaching

2.6.1 Supposition that the language program is the prime directive in classroom activity

2.6.2 Supposition that requirements such as English produce a high "drop-out" rate

2.6.2.1 Panel member calls for English to become an "elective", where students could choose areas that "interest or are useful to them."

2.7 Panel member calls for the utilization of a "universal language" as Mr. Caldwell has employed in his writings.

2.7.1 Mr. Caldwell

2.7.1.1 Question of the "generation gap" as historical construct

2.7.1.2 Anecdote as to his graduate school training in a student conducted discussion program

2.7.1.2.1 Caldwell supposition of the teacher as a "facilitator"

2.7.1.2.2 Caldwell supposition that student rebellion is caused by lack of expression

2.7.1.2.3 Caldwell suppositions: (unexplained)

1. College age generation gap
2. College graduate students have the only educational freedom

2.7.1.3 Caldwell on "teacher training"

2.7.1.3.1 Caldwell supposition that teachers in a classroom must have a monitoring system to get feedback

2.7.1.3.1.1 Caldwell suppositio that feedback "woul work best in a self-monitoring system"

Synopsis

This section of the sensorium was a particularly interesting one focusing on the concept of student/teacher relationships and their observation within the classroom.

The section began when a panel member stated that, when viewing an individual through any means, tapes/film/direct, etc., the teacher is, in reality, perceiving this individual "in his uniqueness and (you) begin to perceive him as a social isolate". The panel then focused on the question of "student and teacher choice" and the effects forced choice might have on the student. The supposition, through a panel member, was that in influencing the student, the teacher may make a decision that could be perceived as "unnatural" for the student. This statement led to the question of teacher role; consensus being achieved by the panel that, within the classroom, the teacher is both the "expert" and a facilitator of change. The panel then focused on the issue of the "classroom" as the medium within which student/teacher interaction occurs. Although related as being an "enormously complex incomprehensible thing", further analysis of the classroom was not attempted.

Dr. Gearing continued the discussion of a teacher's classroom role. He made several points that: 1) within the class the teacher is "most important"; 2) studies must center on the question of helping the teacher understand classroom activity and 3) in student-teacher interaction, the concept of "role" is paramount. This questioning of the teacher was continued through an analysis of teaching methods/ effectiveness in relation to "constrained" school environments. Utilizing the subject of English as a medium, a panel member related that English should be "made an elective within high schools" and that "curricular requirements have led to the high drop-out rate".

The panel then turned to Mr. Caldwell for his views on the point under discussion. Initially, a panel member questioned Mr. Caldwell as to his use of "universal language" in his writings. Mr. Caldwell, utilizing the "generation gap" as a tool, recounted the development of the school and the position of the teacher as a facilitator to assist students in "self-expression". Mr. Caldwell then addressed the issues of teacher training and preparation, making the point that, within a classroom all teachers need a performance "monitoring system" designed "to give feedback". At the close of the session, Mr. Caldwell conclude stating that his opinion was "the best system would be one that was self- (meaning to the individual teachers) monitored."

Reaction

This was an interesting session that could be categorized by the term "communication".

In this session the panel focused on the role of the classroom teacher as an originator/facilitator of "communication". The communicative emphasis was two-fold: as facilitating presentation/learning of material and as a "feedback" mechanism designed to assist the teach in self-evaluation. Also discussed, to a limited degree, was the structure of circumscribed cirriculum and the feeling that students "progress best with the least constraints" in the form of required curricula.

An informative, helpful session.

Typescript Outline

1.0 Evaluations of success/failure in school programs

- 1.1 Dr. Passow questions the relation of the individual child to such evaluations
    - 1.1.1 Question of childs relationship to peers/society/teacher
    - 1.1.2 Supposition that"school is a system; and as such, question arises as to the best method of manipulating it"
    - 1.1.3 Supposition that "self concept is important"
        - 1.1.3.1 Supposition that teachers must be aware of 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, and, as such must be sensitized to cultural values of the child
        - 1.1.3.2 Development of "respect in the child"
        - 1.1.3.3 Supposition that child should be involved in the "decision making process of the school"
    - 1.1.4 Position of the present school system in relation to above "thin skinned'; "defensive"
        - 1.1.4.1 Supposition that disadvantaged parents cannot operate within parameters of 1.1.4
- 1.2 Mr. Ed Moore -- discussion of community
    - 1.2.1 Supposition that "programs are developed without "sense of community"
    - 1.2.2 Supposition of dichotomous views of "community" held by educators and community members
    - 1.2.3 Supposition that, "without community support, your program is doomed to failure"
        - 1.2.3.1 Supposition that "feedback" or "monitoring" mechanisms need to be internal and external
        - 1.2.3.2 Murray Wax Paper--"Local School Boards--Gophers or Gadflys?"

1.2.3.2.1 Above paper used as supportive document for position that school boards are "economic as opposed to educational"

1.2.3.2.2 Mr. Moore calls for community involvement in educational decisions

1.2.3.2.3 Mr. Moore, however, posits existence of sequela of accountability

1.2.3.2.3.1 Panel member makes supposition that accountability may be seen as "subvertin curriculum to popular opinion"

1.2.4 Panel member posits that the job of the educator is as community/school liaison

1.2.4.1 Question of the P.T.A.

1.2.4.2 Panel member relates anecdote of personal school board membership

1.2.4.3 Panel member introduces the subject of "community control"

1.2.4.3.1 Panel member relates that communit control is a misnomer as many organizations within the community are in reality, vying for control

2.0 Return to the question of disadvantaged children in the schools

2.1 Question of poverty in existent economy

2.2 Question by panel member that "poverty may be related to societal skills--i.e. reading/writing

2.2.1 Supposition that, in looking at the school system, and the disadvantaged, the disadvantaged defy facile encapsulation

2.2.2 Question of the failure in the society

2.3 Supposition of bifurcation of education and formal education

2.3.1 Supposition that the school exists with delimited perspective

2.3.2 Supposition of the lack of consensus in "goals" of the society

  2.3.2.1 Call for some consensus to be achieved

  2.3.2.2 Opinion that lack of consensus is creating some sense of "resentment"

    2.3.2.3.1 Above is challenged by a panel member that claims axiological systems cannot be hierarchially perceived

  2.3.2.4 Supposition that values are "expressed through behavior and as situations of choice'

  2.3.2.5 Panel member questions "are all values/behaviors of equal choice?"

    2.3.2.5.1 Panel member responds utelizing "relativity arguement"

2.4 Question of the role/function of the school

2.4.1 Question of "how far" a school should go in relation to values inculcation

  2.4.1.1 Panel member relates that the school cannot in reality, choose values

2.4.2 Opinion that the schools have not aleviated poverty

2.5 Panel member calls for return to issue of community control

2.5.1 Teacher self-monitoring re-emphasized

2.5.2 Position of relativity of the position of the teacher or monitoring or feedback positions

  2.5.2.1 Panel member questions entropy in cybernetic of information exchange from feedback to teacher to parents etc.

  2.5.2.2 Question of monitoring at "different levels"

Synopsis

Section L, an afternoon session, considered several of the major questions embodied within the subject of the disadvantaged school child

The session began with a discussion of the success/failure of students in school programs. Emphasis was placed on the relationship o the child/school/teacher/program in an attempt ot discover underlying failure causation. Dr. Passow then questioned the school as a sub-system, and, as such, it was called upon for the study of the school "as a system and as such the question arises as to the best method of manipulating it". He then focused on an important aspect of the school/student relationship that of the child's self-concept. Self-concept was discussed as being of great import within the study of the disadvantaged child. The emphasis of the panel was on the "importance of the self-concept" of the child, the development of "respect for the child" and that, as a manifestation of these, "the child must be involved in the decision making process of the school."

The panel focus then shifted to Mr. Moore, who developed a discussion of the aspect of "community" that had previously been discussed by Dr. Tuttle. Mr. Moore, perceiving the school system and community as polar entities, related that "programs in the schools are developed without an understanding of community." He continued, stating that the term "community" which is at the crux of the discussion, has diametrically opposed connotations for the educator and the community. Also related was that, "without community support, your program is doomed to failure." Utilizing this statement as an entree, this panel member approached the subject of "community control Questioning the use of the school board, he related that "community control" in and of itself is a misnomer because the community rarely if ever, achieves the type of consensus necessary to exert sufficient influence to be considered "control." However, he did call for "community involvement in educational decisions", to the point where such involvement was helpful however, he questioned the fact that community control, may, in reality, be "subverting curriculum to popular opinion."

The panel then returned to the question of the disadvantaged child in the schools, emphasizing the issue of "poverty" The term "poverty" was discussed generically, and within the genre of public education. The supposition was made, that, within the schools, poverty may be related to paucity in societal skills, i.e. reading and writing", and that this may indeed, be more meaningful methodology to employ in the analysis of poverty within the schools.

The next issue discussed was the bifurcation to be seen within the use of the term "education" within the sense that "education" exists within both a "formal" and "informal" sense. The supposition was that within the schools, the "formal" is stressed, positing a delimited perception of the term. This delimitation, it is felt by this panel member, is causal in the lack of "consensus" within the goals of the society manifested through the schools. Panel opinion was that "some consensus must be achieved". As teleology and axiology are, by definition, interrelated, the panel discussed the "values" necessary within this system. "Values" were discussed philosophically, with the orientation of the panel leading to the view that "values are relative and expressed through behaviors." A panel member then attempted to relate this discussion to the question of the schools in relation to value inculcation. Within this area, a panel member stated that the school, in reality, cannot take on the role of "choosing values for students."

At the close of the session, the panel again refocused on the issue of community control within the schools. It was felt, however, that "control" is best operationalized via "feedback" or "monitoring" devices that operate between the school/teacher and parent, and that such "monitoring must occur on several (unspecified) levels."

Reaction

Section L was a long session, covering a great deal of new material.

Included in the topics discussed was the school in relation to both the child and the community and the "role" of the school as community-based agency. This session marked the first time that the issue of "community control" was discussed. It must be understood, however, at the time of the sensorium, the Ocean-Hill-Brownsville question was prevalent. The panel, however, has developed a distinct emphasis on "communication" which functions as almost a "common denominator" within the sessions. In this session, it took the form of community/school informational interchange and values clarification, however, in all sessions, it remains a prevalent issue.

SECTION M

Typescript Outline

1.0 Question of feedback/monitoring within the classroom

1.1 Panel member posits that feedback can develop into "invasion of teacher privacy."

1.1.1 Another panel member agrees with 1.1

1.1.2 Panel member posits question of accountability in relation to feedback.

1.1.3 Panel member makes supposition that, "teachers must be in personal control, and happy with what they are doing."

1.1.4 Panel member makes supposition of observation of teacher may be unrepresentative.

2.0 Structure of the school/teaching methodologies

2.1 Supposition that the school must be "open, flexible and competent."

2.2 Panel member makes analogy of school/hospital in a hospital, a surgeon is not constantly monitored or criticized.

2.3 Question of "value" of informational feedback.

2.4 Return to analogy of doctor/educator, supposition that the teachers decisions are not as clearly delineated.

2.5 Question of minority representation/community involvement.

2.5.1 Question of power

2.5.2 Question of "getting people involved."

2.5.3 Panel member posits that the "poor have had a good deal more power than previously imagined"

2.5.3.1 Panel member posits subject of ethnic community nepotism.

2.5.3.2 Panel member counters this position, stating that the "Poles or Germans or Italians never had any kind of power."

2.5.3.2.1 Supposition that for minority groups, "the system never worked for them."

2.5.4 Return to the "values" question

2.5.4.1 Panel member posits position of "values loading" in relation to socio-economic position

2.5.4.2 Question of "value loading" within the school in relationship to ethnic groups

2.5.4.3 Supposition that the schools must create more value choices

2.5.4.4 Question of labeling students due to values they have inculcated, i.e. dropouts

2.5.4.5 Question of educational-employment interface

2.5.4.5.1 Panel member posits that education has not given the necessary skills for economic success.

2.5.4.5.2 Question of "over-training" in relationship to educational/vocational interface

2.5.4.6 Question of values in relation to black/white employment/unemployment differentiation

3.0 Erskine Caldwell

3.1 Mr. Caldwell is questioned on curriculum choice and on the "creative process".

3.1.1 Question of "creativity" in relation to circumscribed courses offered at the university

3.1.2 Mr. Caldwell posits that, at a college level, students must have "freedom of choice"

3.1.2.1 Students must have freedom of choice "apart from the establishment"

3.1.2.2 Question of coercion of the "establishment"

3.1.2.3 Mr. Caldwell posits that student who is free will "go further"

3.1.4 Question of upper level academic freedom in relationship to elementary school

3.1.5 Question of creativity in the elementary schools

  3.1.5.1 Panel member relates that creativity may be "stultified" by teacher interpretation of activities

  3.1.5.2 Dr. Patouillet relates that, to help these individuals all undergraduates should have guidance training.

  3.1.5.3 Panel member relates personal anecdote of college as being a "non-vocationally guiding" experience

3.1.6 Mr. Caldwell

  3.1.6.1 Personal recountation of events that made him go into writing--"it was my desire to be amon people, and my inclination was to write it down"

Synopsis

This session continued the analysis of the feedback question as developed at the close of the last session. In this session, emphasis was placed upon "feedback as an invasion of teacher privacy." Feedback was, to one panel member, to be understood within the parameters of "accountability." The panel then refocused on a previously discussed area the belief that, for feedback to be operationalized, the teacher must be "in personal control and happy with what they (sic.) are doing." However, at the close of discussion on this issue, a panel member related that teacher observation/feedback, as a sampling technique, "may be 'unrepresentative' of the wider actions that the teacher may manifest."

The panel then focused on the issue of the school and teaching methodologies, emphasis being placed upon the school as "open, flexibl and competent." This view led directly into an analysis of the school in relation to both minority group relations and as a community involvement agency, the supposition was that "power" which was received generally as "getting people involved." However, this position was countered by another panel member who stated that, in reality, "the poor have had a good deal more power than previously imagined." This panel member supported this position through the use of anecdotal information on community/political nepotism. However, this panel member was refuted by another who stated that "Poles or Germans never had that sort of power." Despite the conjecture, howeve the undergirding panel tone was, that within minority groups, "the system has never worked for them."

At this point the panel returned to the question of "values". The emphasis at this time was, however, on the question of "values/ schools" in relation to the disadvantaged child. The disclosure was initiated by a panel member who related that the school, as an institution has become "value loaded" in relation to ethnic groups, and has through this orientation, "labeled children." The question of values was expounded in the domain of the racial employment/ unemployment question, however, this question was not discussed in depth.

The sensorium then focused on Erskine Caldwell. Initially, Mr. Caldwell was questioned by another panel member on his opinion on the question of "creativity" within the schools. Positing that creativity must be a "working component" of university programs, Mr. Caldwell called for students to develop "freedom of choice apart from the establishment" and that the student who develops in this manner, will, in reality "go further." A panel member then, taking Mr. Caldwells' lead, questioned whether such "creativity facilitating" programs could be employed in elementary school. This member, joined by Dr. Patouillet, stated the shared belief that creativity is indeed "important," however, it is frequently "stultified" by teachers through their choice of programs.

The session closed with a panel member questioning Mr. Caldwell on his personal motivation for writings, however, this was not discusse in depth.

Reaction

This session continued the in-depth analysis of the "position" of the schools, its philosophical/social/psychological bases and its "place" within society.

At this point the panel is positing; both circumscribed developed views on the issues of feedback, values clarification and the role of the school as a community acculteration agent. The panel although relating that some "feedback" into the "teaching system" is necessary, however, has not yet achieved consensus on the methodology to operationalize this theoretical construct. The panel is now functioning cohesively with the aforementioned feedback/operationalization issue the sole unresolved question.

SECTION N

Typescript Outline

1.0 The disadvantaged child in the classroom

- 1.1 Dr. Keith makes supposition that the sensorium is bifurcated into social scientists and educators
  - 1.1.1 Dr. Keith makes supposition that much of what the panel states is not "going on in the real world"
- 1.2 Dr. Keith relates that the disadvantaged child makes "special demands" within the classroom
- 1.3 Dr. Keith states that supervisor/teacher liaison is poor
- 1.4 Dr. Keith relates that teachers are successful by "balancing the two issues--the methodological and the social system of the teacher and pupil"
  - 1.4.1 Panel member expands this, stating that teachers are professionals, and as such have developed facilitative attitudes towards disadvantaged children
- 1.5 Dr. Keith relates that many of the parents are not in agreement with educators or social scientists
- 1.6 Dr. Keith posits partnership of parents/teachers Parents know the child best, and the teacher is the subject matter specialist
- 1.7 Dr. Keith posits generalizations within the study of the disadvantaged child in the classroom
  - 1.7.1 "Every research study shows that in educating the disadvantaged, content in the class is subordinate to climate in the classroom"
  - 1.7.2 "Children learn best in an open climate"
  - 1.7.3 The question of language must be investigated
    - 1.7.3.1 Panel member posits the existence of programs that utilize disadvantaged children's dialect in beginning of schools and switch to other types later on

1.7.3.2 Panel member relates Ohio State study in which transformational grammar was shown to affect students later learning in a positive dimension

1.7.3.3 Panel member further relates that in the utilization of this type of program, contemporary evaluation systems would be incompatible

1.7.3.3.1 Panel member relates that program such as 1.7.3.2 are an attempt to achieve "adaptive education"

1.8 Adaptive Education as posited by panel member relating 1.7.3.3.1

1.8.1 Adaptive education would allow student to move at their own learning rate

1.8.2 Adaptive education would end "gradedness" in schools

1.8.3 Adaptive education would end "time periods" and such constraints in the classroom

1.8.4 Panel member posits that adaptive education is "more work" and, as such, would be objected to by teachers

1.9 "Humanities for the Disadvantaged"--a program conducted at a Harlem school

1.9.1 This program, although not analyzed by the panel, was held as important in that "subjective" evaluative devices were employed

1.10 Disadvantaged Child Program at University of Chicago

1.10.1 In this program children choose their own teachers

1.10.1.1 Panel member posits that 60% of the students need this type of program, 40% do not

1.10.2 Panel member relates that such programs are not amenable to structure by behavioral objectives

2.0 Panel member reinstitutes question of what/who of disadvantagement

2.1 Supposition that sensorium has been "skirting the issue"

2.2 Panel member calls for better diagnosis of all children to ascertain needs

    2.2.1 Panel member states that school must focus on individual groups and state "what the educational system is or is not doing for these kids"

2.3 Panel member relates that we must focus on small groups, and that "we must develop some direction"

3.0 Planning for next session -- agenda

3.1 Areas of agenda

    3.1.1 Analysis of the institution, its life, death, and creation

    3.1.2 Analysis of the failings of common teaching methodologies in reaching the child

    3.1.3 Teacher training and feedback

    3.1.4 The "whole problem of the disadvantaged"

    3.1.5 The question of the position of the school system in relation to sub-cultures

    3.1.6 The question of students instructing other students

Synopsis

Section N began with a rediscussion of the child within the classroom. It was the belief of several panel members as introduced by Dr. Ketih, that the disadvantaged child makes "special demands" within the classroom. It was also stated that the teacher must act as a liaison between the school and the home. Within this view, several panel members related that their opinion was that the teacher has thus far done an inadequate job. This position was then directly countered by another panel member who related that teachers "are indeed successful" by "balancing two issues -- the methodological and the social system of the teacher and the pupil". Little consensus was achieved on this issue, the position of the teacher; and the area closed when a panel member related that, within the study of the disadvantaged child, frequently, parents are not in accord with educators and social scientists.

An additional panel member then questioned the curricular aspects of the classroom, relating that "content in a class of disadvantaged children is to be seen as subordinate to climate". This view was expanded, when this panel member related that "children learn best in an open climate". The subject of classroom climate as related to curriculum and learning propensity programs was then analyzed by another panel member. This panel member related the existence of programs (unspecified) that utilize disadvantaged childrens' home dialect as a learning/facilitation tool, and, after a period, graduall switch instruction to Standard English. Another panel member related the Ohio State studies of "transformational grammar", as a program of the same ilk as the one the previous speaker had discussed.

At this time, utilizing the concept of learning programs that could/should involve the disadvantaged, the topic of "adaptive education" was discussed by another panel member. "Adaptive education was posited as an open education model that would allow students to "proceed at their own rate", abolish "gradedness", "time periods" and other classroom constraints. Although stated philosophically, a panel member questioned the "delivery" of such a program as it would "produce more work, and as such, would be objected to by teachers and teacher unions".

The sensorium then refocused through one panel member, on the "what/who" question of disadvantagement. Positing that the sensorium had "skirted the issue" this panel member called for "more accurate" and "better" diagnosis of the educational needs of disadvantaged children. Relating that education of the disadvantaged must focus on "small groups" and "develop direction" (unspecified) this panel member stated that the sensorium must "state what the educational system is/i not doing for these (disadvantaged) kids.

This session concluded with a synthesis presentation by Dr. Weatherford, who identified four areas thus far discussed one related to institution -- the principals do not listen to teachers, teachers not listening to children, etc., two, teaching techniques applicable for disadvantaged children, three, teacher training, and four, the whole problem of who are disadvantaged and what the implications are.

Reaction

The main thrust of this section developed along two foci the child in the classroom and the development of "adaptive education".

In the previous sessions, the panel began to derive some consensu as to the "who" of disadvantagement; the emphasis now would seem to be on "what to do with" this individual, within the school. The underlyi emphasis, to this observer, however, remains on "relevancy", that attempt to maximize social/intellectual "interface" between the home/culture/school.

An interesting development in this section was that of adaptive education: that education whose philosophical raison d'etre is to maximize the propensity of such an interface. In operationalizing the concepts of "adaptive education" the epistemology embodied drew heavily on the "open education" model.

The sensorium seems to be heading to a systematic analysis of the school in relation to the disadvantaged: the sole unanswered question is the "how" of the "feedback" issue that has been discussed in previous sessions.

Typescript Outline

1.0 Hawthorne Effect

    1.1 Panel member posits that Hawthorne effect is "on the teacher not the student"

    1.2 Panel member relates that educators "keep touching on things that are on the periphery"

        1.2.1 This panel member calls the institutions of more "global" methodologies

        1.2.2 Panel member questions effect of Head Start

2.0 Question of community is reintroduced

    2.1 Question of "community plurality" is introduced

    2.2 Question of the "parochial emphasis of schools"

3.0 Panel member introduces the question of teacher preparation

    3.1 Panel member relates that university people cannot "answer all of the questions"

    3.2 Panel member posits that the university functions to "give you perspective in which you can look at the school in a different way than we've looked at it before"

    3.3 Panel member questions "expected behavior" of teachers

        3.3.1 Panel member questions "what type of competencies are you to develop in the class?"

        3.3.2 Panel member questions involving of parents in the teaching process

        3.3.3 Panel member posits that expected behaviors cannot be specified

            3.3.3.1 Panel member questions "role development" in children.

            3.3.3.2 Panel member questions the school as a "learning environment"

            3.3.3.3 Panel member questions the "behavioral expectations" of the classroom.

3.3.4 Panel member posits question of the teacher "responsible to the community through her syllabus"

  3.3.4.1 Panel member additionally posits that this is a "restrictive environment with respect to innovation"

  3.3.4.2 Using the "kindergarten," a panel member posits that among educators, some consensus can be achieved as to the goals or "possibilities"

  3.3.4.3 Question of classroom organizational theory

    3.3.4.3.1 Methodology of age grading'

    3.3.4.3.2 Methodology of "curriculum expenances"

    3.3.4.3.3 Methodology of "certain learning styles"

  3.3.4.4 Panel member questions the mobility/status question of teachers-to gain "recognition" they must leave the classroom and go to administration

3.4 Moderator states ground rules for next days session and hope that "teacher training" and "multi discipline" methods will be discussed

Synopsis

Section O began with a discussion of the "Hawthorne Effect" on students and teachers in educational settings. The panel member presenting this issue stated that this phenomenon can be best illustrated demonstrability through "the teacher, not the student." This panel member then entered into the question that educators "keep touching on things that are on the periphery" and do very little to change the total educational environment. Attempt to change few teachers in an isolated workshop is not going to have an overall effect. The teacher training programs need to be more integrated. Within this discussion of programs/methodologies, a panel member questioned the effect of "Head Start" programs in disadvantaged childrer although this issue was not pursued.

The next issue mentioned was that "community plurality" exists as a polar construct to the "parochial emphasis of schools." Introduced by one panel member as a personal viewpoint, this supposition was not discussed/analyzed in depth.

Teacher preparation was the next issue to be discussed. Taking the role of the educator, a panel member related, that within the university setting, one cannot be expected to "answer all questions." This panel member did relate, however, that "the function of the university is to give perspectives in which you look at the school in differing ways that we've looked at it before." On the subject of teacher preparation, "expected teacher behaviors" in relation to intellectual and social competencies colleges of education are attempting to develop was posited by a panel member, however, not expanded upon. This panel member further related that the school must be a "learning environment" and assist in the "role development" of children.

The question of "teacher/classroom/educational system and communit interface" was then discussed, mentioning the school as a social systen and related that the teacher is, in reality "responsible to the community through the syllabus." The position of this panel member wa that such a preconceived syllabus functions as a "restrictive environment with respect to innovation." Also questions related to classroom organizational methodologies such as "age-grading," curriculu experiences" "learning styles and possibilities" as strategies/. structures to be employed in teaching the disadvantaged were mentioned, however, no details were provided.

The session then ended with a closing by the moderator who called for the final session individual reports to emphasize "teacher training" and "the disadvantaged child."

Reaction

This section continued the discussion of the teacher/methodologie and the community. As the panel has previously achieved some consensu on the issue of the what/who of disadvantaged, the panel seems to be functioning with this concept clearly in mind.

The major new area discussed was on "role expected behavior" on the part of the teacher. This behavior was illustrated by the syllabu each teacher must write and by the "behavioral expectations" of the classroom.

The session closed with a vigorous address by the moderator who called for individual presentations on the following, and last day of the sensorium.

SECTION P

Typescript Outline

1.0 Dr. Robert Weatherford, Introduction of Panel Members

1.1 Dr. Harry Passow - Curriculum

1.2 Mr. Erskine Caldwell - Novelist

1.3 Dr. Herbert Aurbach - Sociology

1.4 Dr. Charles Keith - Child Psychology

1.5 Dr. Fred Gearing - Anthropology

1.6 Dr. Edward Fagan - English Education and Linguistics

1.7 Dr. Raymond Patouillet - Guidance

1.8 Dr. Robert Dwyer - Special Education

1.9 Dr. Joan Duval - Early Education

1.10 Dr. Marguerite Follett - Early Childhood and Special Educati

1.11 Mr. Edward Moore - Special Education

2.0 Dr. Harry Passow

2.1 Supposition that "in certain sense all pupils are disadvantaged in the sense that they are not being developed to their fullest potential."

2.2 Supposition that "I do believe that there are individuals, who tend to come from low income, racial and ethnic groups, for whom even the greatest system does not function satisfactorily."

2.2.1 This panel member posits the question of "why" this does not work for the disadvantaged.

2.2.1.1 Dr. Passow questions the genetic approach of Dr. Arthur Jensen

2.2.1.2 Dr. Passow posits the "egalitarian model" that is unequal for disadvantaged children.

2.2.2 Question of equality

2.2.2.1 "Now the whole notion of equality is again a notion that needs analysis because equality again depends upon one's belief as to whether we're talking about inputs and their quality"

2.2.3 Question of differentiation of needs of disadvantaged children "in Florida or in Harlem"

2.2.3.1 The function of education is to focus on "aspects of education that make a difference'

2.2.3.2 Dr. Passow posits that the "first place to start is with the instructor"

2.2.3.2.1 Dr. Passow questions the individu instructor's "bias and prejudices'

2.2.3.2.2 "Love and goodwill" are not enoug one must "confront the background behind this love and goodwill"

2.2.3.2.3 Dr. Passow questions teachers in their ability to individualize instruction

2.2.4 Question of "curriculum and resources for curriculum"

2.2.4.1 Dr. Passow states that "we must examine what constitutes relevant curriculum and resource for curriculum"

2.2.4.1.1 "Relevant curriculum is a functio of community/school interface"

3.0 Mr. Erskine Caldwell

3.1 Question of education and the creative person

3.1.1 Mr. Caldwell states that "after kindergarten or Head Start, the individual is stifled."

3.1.1.1 Mr. Caldwell posits that, because of these "roadblocks, the exceptional child will favo being just an ordinary creative person"

3.1.1.2 Mr. Caldwell-"There should be some method fo a learner to not have to go through years of being stifled"

4.0 Dr. Aurbach states that "one of the major problems of the disadvantaged is the terminology that we use to label these peopl

4.1 Dr. Aurbach states "that much of the labeling was ethnocentr

4.2 Terminology must be made more precise

4.3 Dr. Aurbach posits that much of the research in the field is "overly general"

4.4 Dr. Aurbach reminds the panel that within the term "disadvantaged" there is wide intra-group variability

4.4.1 Supposition that the panel must accept this "cultural difference"

4.5 Dr. Aurbach states that "the school must be examined as an instrument of change" in order to "understand its structure"

4.5.1 Dr. Aurbach states that in "understanding" school structure we may "understand why some students do/do not achieve"

4.5.2 Dr. Aurbach states that redefinition of failure/succe parameters must be discussed

4.5.2.1 Disadvantaged children must develop "self concepts that will allow them to believe the can learn in the system"

4.5.2.2 Teachers must be sensitized that the system can work and respect disadvantaged children

4.5.2.3 Schools must use cultural inputs of disadvantaged children.

4.6 The school as a societal change element

4.6.1 Dr. Aurbach states that the school to be "effective" must involve minority groups

4.6.2 Dr. Aurbach closes, calling for a complete re-examination of the schooling system

5.0 Dr. Fred Gearing

5.1 Supposition that "the disadvantaged" are not a new group, b "have existed for centuries"

5.2 Supposition that "the field of educational inquiry is fraugh with generalities"

5.3 Education and the disadvantaged child

5.3.1 Supposition that we must "look at the individual child", "he is the pathway of our endeavors", "he is critical"

5.3.1.1 Dr. Gearing offers "a practical suggestion"- "to enhance pupil interaction - find a commo pathway" - a way for the teacher to get maximum performance from all children.

5.3.2 Supposition that "in understanding society, the schoo and university create the spearhead"

5.3.3 Supposition that the disadvantaged are "not only poor but powerless"

5.3.3.1 Supposition that differing cultures still revere basic educational skills, i.e. readin

5.3.3.2 Supposition that schools do "an excellent jo in maintaining status quo in society"

5.3.3.2.1 Suppositions that schools are "reinactments - simulations of American life"

5.3.4 Supposition that schools constitute a "total assault" on children of differing cultures

5.3.4.1 Use of behavior modification "shaping" techniques

5.3.5 Communicative/linguistic differences in education

5.3.5.1 Child-child interaction

5.3.5.2 Child-parent interaction

5.3.5.3 Effect of linguistic studies that show all individuals have "multiple dialects"

5.3.5.4 Supposition that learning is "learning to us the proper dialect"

5.3.6 Classroom interaction is posited as a major influence in the child's learning

6.0 Dr. Edward Fagan - effects of language on students

6.1 Question of stereotypic language

6.2 Effects of "hamburgerizing" children via language structures

6.2.1 Language must "constitute a major aspect of approaching communication in the classroom"

6.2.2 "Interdisciplinary approach" to teaching English

6.2.3 Question of "behavioral objectives"

6.2.4 Question of "individualized instruction"

6.2.5 Call for increased flexibility where the curriculum will be "flexible and allow for a greater role of electives"

6.3 Rediscussion of linguistics

6.3.1 The effect of linguistic study on classroom language

6.3.2 The effect of "pre-packaged, rigid materials" that d not allow for student dialectical differences

6.3.3 Question of "English as a second language"

6.3.4 Question of making language instruction more meaningful for students

6.3.5 The Moffatt Approach - an attempt to achieve relevan in language instruction by using student created materials

7.0 Dr. Raymond Patouillet

7.1 Statement that his "opinion of guidance and that of the group may differ"

7.2 "The field of guidance has something to contribute to educating the disadvantaged"

7.3 "Guidance is the individualizing of learning"

7.3.1 Undergirding philosophy of guidance must be "acceptance of individuals"

7.3.2 Guidance must view the school as a "social institution and a learning environment"

7.3.3 Supposition that the "quality of interpersonal relationships is the most important part of the effectiveness of teaching"

7.3.4 Supposition that the guidance counselor is a "mediator in relating between teachers and students in the subjective personal worlds"

8.0 Panel member responding at the close of this session

8.1 This panel member states that he agrees with Dr. Gearing's views of cultural deprivation

8.2 Question of dialect/language is re-introduced

9.0 Moderator reads a short paragraph that relates linguistic difficulties of the disadvantaged

9.1 Dr. Aurbach questions "community involvement"

9.2 Dr. Aurbach questions "who runs for school boards?"

9.3 Dr. Aurbach questions "defensiveness of the school"

9.3.1 Dr. Aurbach states that, in reality the school is not involved with the community

9.3.2 Dr. Aurbach calls for school system decentralization

9.4 Dr. Aurbach questions minority group representation on school boards

9.5 Panel member questions statements of Dr. Aurbach relating that both "the school" and "involvement" are terms that must be redefined and used with greater precision

9.5.1 Panel member questions "what is community involvement?

9.5.2 Question of language differences

9.5.2.1 Effect of changing your "first language"

9.5.2.2 Supposition that some "bilingual education" techniques can be employed in "bidialectical education"

9.5.3.3 Panel member states that many dialects employ greater specificity than standard English"

9.5.3.4 Panel member relates feeling that "calling dialects inferior is wrong"

9.5.3.5 Panel member relates that dialect use and role are "interrelated"

10.0 The "Carnegie Unit" is discussed as a component of the structural hierarchy of the school

10.1 Panel member relates that in New York City, experiments have been done to "encourage flexibility" in a "free school" atmosphere

10.2 Panel member poses the question of the "bureaucratic nature of education hierarchies"

11.0 Question - "You have said that teachers must develop different programs for different groups, and have also said that middle class values must predominate. . .is this a contradiction?"

11.1 Answer - "No, within a heterogeneous grouping of students you must individualize instruction, but, for all groups basic skills are necessary"

11.2 Panel member answering 8.1 posits the influence of student interaction within the classroom

12.0 Question - Are educators educating towards discontent?

12.1 No, educators are "attempting to open up whatever potential the student has"

12.2 Supposition that the school must not use techniques such as "teaching" as methods of de facto segregation

12.3 Supposition that, within a pluralistic society, "many option are created"

12.4 Panel member relates that "the job of education is to provid as many effective opportunities as possible and to maximize individual potential"

13.0 Panel member questions Mr. Caldwell on the "callousness" that he has shown the disadvantaged to express in his books

13.1 Mr. Caldwell relates that Tobacco Road must not be understoo apart from its temporal context.

13.2 Supposition of "cultural match" i.e. growing up in a particular culture that serves you and that is designed to "include not exclude you"

14.0 Re-examination of the "we-they" constructs of society

14.1 Panel member relates that cultures must divest themselves of this type of bifurcation

14.2 Panel member relates that, in the light of 14.1, that schools must "divest themselves of terms such as 'good' and 'bad' in relating to behaviors of disadvantaged children

14.2.1 Question of school expectations of disadvantaged children

14.2.2 Panel member proposes question of "love" within the schools

14.2.2.1 Panel member relates that school must not be "amoralizing"

14.2.2.2 Panel member posits that the school must provide alternatives for "student developmen

14.2.2.3 Panel member posits that the school must be aware of differences in student goals/expectations

14.2.3 Question of teacher "standards"

14.2.3.1 Panel member relates that teachers must increase students' self-concept

14.2.3.2 Panel member relates that teachers must "experiment in real-life situations

14.3 Re-examination of teacher role.

14.3.1 Panel member relates the difficulty of the job of the teacher

14.3.2 Question of teacher overloads

14.3.3 Panel member posits that the teacher should "go out, poke around and see how these kids (disadvantaged) live"

Synopsis

Section P began with an address from the moderator, naming the individuals present and their fields. They are

	Name	Field
A	Dr. Harry Passow	Curriculum
B	Mr. Erskine Caldwell	Novelist
C	Dr. Herbert Aurbach	Sociology
D	Dr. Charles Keith	Child Psychiatry
E	Dr. Fred Gearing	Anthropology
F	Dr. Edward Fagan	English Education and Linguistics
G	Dr. Raymond Patouillet	Guidance
H	Dr. Robert Dwyer	Special Education
I	Dr. John Duval	Early Education
J	Dr. Marguerite Follett	Early Childhood and Special Education
K	Mr. Edward Moore	Special Education

The opening address was from Dr. Passow, who began by questioning the "semantics" of the problem of disadvantagement. He stated that in the intellectual sense, all students are disadvantaged as they "do not develop to their fullest extent." In taking the generalized approach, he related that, for these people normally adjudged to be disadvantage "the system (meaning the socio-educational--societal constructs) does not "function effectively." In attempting to explain the development of the disadvantaged population Dr. Passow questioned two models.

These were the genetically oriented one of Dr. Jensen (vide "How Far can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement") and the "egalitarian" model. He chose not to examine these in depth, however, and instead went on to the subject of equality. Again taking the methodology of semantic inquiry he related that "equality is indeed a relative term a term that depends on the "system under investigation and the typolo of the inputs/outputs germane to that system." Dr. Passow, also, within this relativistic study questioned the differentation of needs that the disadvantaged child might have in "Harlem as opposed to Florida." The next issue discussed by this panel member was the role of the instructor within an educational system. It was his suppositi that within a study of education, "the first place to start is with t instructor." Stating that, although "teacher concern" is of great import, "love and goodwill are not enough," he initiated a questionin of teacher effectiveness/constructional methodologies. As a curricul specialist, he stated that the curriculum must be made relevant and that "we must examine what constitutes relevant curriculum." Althoug not discussed in depth, his supposition was that "relevancy" was to b achieved through closer "community/school" interface.

The panel then turned to Mr. Caldwell the novelist, who address the question of the "creative person." His emphasis within this was on the "creative person and the 'roadblocks' the system builds in to thwart this individual's attempts at expression." Although he did not elaborate, he stated that "after kindergarten, this individual is stifled" and that, "there should be some method (unspecified) for an individual to not have to go through these years of being stifled."

The individual presentation continued with Dr. Aurbach, the sociologist. Following the lead of other panel members, Dr. Aurbach began his analysis of the disadvantaged child through the vehicle of linguistic analysis. He related that "one of the major problems of the study of the disadvantaged is the terminology we use to label these people." Stating that the genesis of such labeling was ethnocentricism he called for such terminology to be reinvestigated (methodology unspecified) and, if employed, to do so with far greater precision.

Dr. Aurbach then addressed the issue of the schools as an instrument of social change. He stated that researchers must "understand the school as a change element," as well as "understand the structure of the school." It was his felt belief, that within an in-depth analysis of "school structures, "many insights may be achieved a greater understanding of student failure, the position of the school as a socio-cultural change agent and the school as a vehicle to achieve "greater relevancy with minority groups."

The next individual speaker was Dr. Gearing, the Anthropologist. Dr. Gearing began by relating that, as an Anthropologist, the issue of disadvantagement had a historical dimension and that it has "existed for centuries." However, the major thrust of his presentation was on the school, the child and their educational system. He began by stating strongly that "we (educators) must again look at the individual child" as "he is the pathway of our endeavors." He also called for the development of a "working relationship" with this child and the development of a "common pathway" that would maximize teacher effectiveness in working with all children. Dr. Gearing then focused on the issue of the cultural biases of the schools in relation to the disadvantaged child. He related that disadvantaged groups were "not only poor, but powerless" and that the schools, in attempting to maintain societal homeostasis, have constituted a "total assault" (unspecified) on the disadvantaged child.

Dr. Gearing closed on the issue of linguistics and the disadvantaged child. In addressing the question of dialect,that the panel had previously explored, he related that, although dialect exists teachers must "facilitate learning" by teaching students to "use the proper (unspecified) dialect."

The next speaker was Dr. Fagan, who directly addressed the questio of language and the disadvantaged child. This panel member related that language, as a common denominator has lead the sequela of "hamburgerizing" students through the rigidity of linguistic structures This panel member closed with an analysis of the various linguistics techniques that may be employed within the classroom. Included were "inter-disciplinary teaching", "behavioral objectives" and "individualized instruction" as methodologies of achieving a "greater flexibility in the curriculum." Directly taking issue with "pre-packaged" learning/instructional aids this panel member related that "dialect can be used as a facilitator in the mastery of Standard English" and that through techniques such as the "Moffatt approach", in which students developed their own materials, greater relevancy may be achieved in working with the disadvantaged.

The session then turned to Dr. Patouillet who used the time to describe his views on the field of guidance, this fields' applicability within the area of the disadvantaged child. Relating that the undergirding philosophy of "guidance" must be the "facilitatic of learning on a personal basis," he stated his felt belief that the "quality of interpersonal relationships is the most important part of the effectiveness of teaching." He closed, relating his view that the function of the "guidance professional" must be to act as a "moderator in the relations that the disadvantaged child and the school may engag in.

The moderator then read a short paragraph directly relating to th previously mentioned topics of "labeling" and "linguistics" within the schools from Dr. Passow's book Education for the Disadvantaged.

> "I used to think I was poor. Then they told me I wasn't poor--I was needy. Then they told me it was self-defeating to think of myself as needy--I was deprived. Then they told me deprived was a bad image--I was under-privileged. Then they told me under-privileged was overused--I was disadvantaged. I still don't have a dime--but I have a damned good vocabulary."

This short statement was vigorously responded to by panel members who stated that the school is a community institution that warrants close re-examination. The panel then refocused on some of the suppositions that Dr. Aurbach had made in previous sections. Precisely, a panel member questioned Dr. Aurbach's use of the terms "school" and "involvement," notably "community involvement."

The session then focused directly on the linguistic issue and its dialect component. Discussed was the effects on disadvantaged children who, in reality, are taught English as a second language, this was felt to be the case in students who either did not speak English or were so "dialectical" that standard English instruction may take on the connotation of a "second language." This point was expounded by anoth another panel member who related that to maximize instructional output and relevancy, students must "be initially taught reading and writing through a methodology and by a language (dialect) "that they're comfortable with." Stating that dialect differences were not inherently "inferior," a panel member related in reality, that certain dialects "embody greater specificity than standard English."

The panel then turned its investigation to the "Carnegie unit." This unit is a measure of credit within high school, very similar in nature to the credit one receives in college. It was discussed by this panel member as a methodology by which the schools have become structured and "inflexible" in not allowing students to develop personal curriculums.

The sensorium was then left open to questions from the audience. Discussed were areas such as "the development of individualized learning programs that retained an emphasis on reading/writing skills," "heterogeneity of student groupings" and "the influence of student interaction within the classroom." A particularly insightful question was "Are educators educating towards discontent?" This question was handled by several panel members, who in giving their personal insights posited that, "education is a facilitator, an attempt to allow each student to develop to his maximum" and that the "job of education is to provide as many affective opportunities as possible to maximize student learning propensity."

Several short questions followed, the first of which questioned the "we-they" (Buber) bifurcation developed in Section A This division was seen by the panel as important, and panel consensus was that "schools must divest themselves of such terms as "good" and "bad which, it was felt have been used to reinforce the cultural identity differentiation between the disadvantaged child and the dominent group. Continuing on the subject of the disadvantaged child and the schools, panel members called for the school to attempt to develop "alternative for student development" (unspecified) but, however, that in attemptin to incorporate children into the schools, they should avoid the "amoralizing" influence it was felt schools may exert.

At the close of the sensorium, a panel member attempting to overview the material discussed, re-examined the role of the teacher. Of particular note was the felt belief that "the teacher does indeed have a difficult job" and that the teacher must gain greater interface with the community of the disadvantaged by "poking around to see how they (the disadvantaged) live."

Reaction

This section began with Dr. Passow who gave his report, concentrating directly on the question of disadvantagement. Taking the methodology of semantic inquiry, he questioned the term "disadvantagement" and also the categorizing of individuals or groups under its all inclusive banner. Hitting heavily on the area of relevancy he investigated the school, teachers/teacher effectiveness and the role of the curriculum.

Mr. Caldwell gave a short presentation related to the type of individual who may be in his field, the creative person. Relating his belief that this person is not "serviced" in the schools he called for a basic modification of the schooling process to facilitate teachin students and encouraging this creativity.

The sensorium then continued with individual reports by Drs. Aurbach, Gearing and Fagan. The leitmotiv of all presentations, at this point is the question of linguistics as they relate to serving the disadvantaged child and the understanding of the school as a socio-cultural change agent.

Many aspects of linguistics were discussed, ranging from "teaching methodologies" and "relevancy" to the utilization of the disadvantaged child's home dialect as an agent of entree into the school setting.

Dr. Patouillet then gave his presentation, stressing both the relevancy and usefulness of guidance in "getting to" the disadvantaged child. This view was of the counselor as "facilitator" and "mediator" a person who, within the school setting, could best achieve the long sought after school/student/community/teacher interface.

The major emphasis, however, was on the subject of linguistics an the disadvantaged child. In this section the area of linguistics that was emphasized was "teaching strategies" that utilized various dialect as "facilitation agents" to assist in achieving student learning and education relevancy. An interesting point made within this discussion was of the use of dialects within the genre of bilingual education, an the "linguistic specificity superiority" that many dialects were seen to embody.

The emphasis of the sensorium then switched to the subject of the role of the school and the teacher. Responding to a particularly mordant question Are the schools teaching discontent?, several panel members discussed the role and goals of the teacher in working with th disadvantaged child. Emphasis was again placed on the intrinsic value of all students and that each student is a peculiar/particular entity within himself. The sensorium emphasis was best developed by one panel member who related that "the job of the school is to allow each student to open up to his fullest potential" and that the "school must develop as many affective options for student development as possible."

The aforementioned two insights are, I feel, the major emphasis of this section and of the whole sensorium.

Concluding Impressions

1. Harry Passow

I intend to prepare my remarks while the others were speaking, so now they'll have that opportunity. The assignment, near as I can gather, was rather vague--talk for five or ten minutes with one or two of ideas I might have. I almost feel like I'm supposed to give a one-page version of War and Peace. But let me give few comments which would express my own biases and my own views in the area. First of all, it seems to me that in a certain sense all of our pupils are disadvantaged if we consider that all education which does not provide for the fullest development of the individual potential. That is, education today is in a sad state and, therefore, all people are disadvantaged. Now one could take that position and argue it rather strongly so that, in effect, the recipients are the clients or patrons of education are all disadvantaged. But I would rather use the term in a more specialized, more restrictive way, not denying the fact that more education would be vastly improved. In fact, as a curriculum specialist, this is my business, so to speak. But I do believe that there are individuals, groups of individuals, who tend to come from low income, from racial and ethnic minority groups, for whom even the present system does not function very satisfactorily. No matter how one defines the ends and goals of American Education, we simply are not achieving very well or not succeeding very well with this group. And it is this group that I would rather call the disadvantaged. And the question, of course, is why these youngsters are not achieving and why the school is not succeeding with them. There are a number of theories, a number of explanations. One of the existing theories, it seems to me, really by itself explains the problem and gives us clear-cut leads as to how we might deal with such a problem. There are, of course, the people who argue the basis of genetics. The recen furor that Jensen stirred up with his article and which has coined a phrase, "Jensenism" reopened the nature vs. nurture controversy. I reject the genetic approach, but this is my own reading of the researc There are those who reject equally the deprivation approach. There are those who argue that this is a racist society--a prejudiced society--and the word 'middle class' and the term 'middle class values has become almost rejected by this group. There are those who argue that we simply don't allocate resources adequately. That a dollar spent in a ghetto school does not buy the same dollars' worth of education as a dollar spent in a suburban white middle class school. So we have a number of explanations and a number of attempts to interpret and analyze, and it seems to me that our strategies for overcoming or for alleviating the problem are based on our beliefs, whether we express them or not, as to what the cause is. That is, if one is going to improve education for the disadvantaged depends in part on the explanation or the analysis of why the education is such a bad state to begin with. Now, the whole notion of equality again depends upon ones belief as to whether we're talking about equality of input, whether we're talking about equality of output, whether we're talking about equality of results, etc. And here again this is something that one needs to analyze because his plans and his activities would depend upon what he accepts as the basis for moving out. Now, my own feeling is that one of our problems is that we have attempted to arrive at panaceas or uniform solutions. We have expected that the single program or project will, in fact, alleviate all of the problems. Now our idea that there are many differences with respect to the needs of individuals, that groups of individuals require differential programs and that no single project is going to really resolve the problem for American school. There are differences it seems to me, for example, if you take blacks living in Harlem. Their needs are different from blacks living in rural Florida. There are differences in Puerto Ricans whose first language is Spanish, for example, as opposed to Mexican Americans whose first language is Spanish. It seems to me that with all these differences that there are certain common elements--and one is that all of them are going to be in some kind of formal schooling situation. It seems to me that they're going to be exposed to some kinds of experiences. And, therefore, in all instances we can begin to focus in on certain aspects certain elements, certain components of the educational process which might make a difference. But we can talk then of education in terms of a teacher and a classroom, or we can talk about a school or a school system or a region, etc. And I would hope that we would talk differently for each of these. And one of our problems is that sometimes we're talking about a teacher in a classroom in one part of our sentence, and in the next part of our sentence we're talking about a school system like New York City with a million kids and a thousand schools, etc. Now I would hope that if I were to begin in my five minutes I can only begin. If I were to begin, where would I begin? I think the key it seems to me, is with the instructor. Now the instructor being the (I'm using the term instructor rather than the teacher) because it seems to me that all staff members, all adults who relate to schools and to schooling--and I might interject here, it seems to me, that one of the things that's happened with respect to the concern for the disadvantaged is that it has broken open our notions of what constitutes schooling. We used to consider that all education or most education took place in the school and the formal situation. And what the concern with the disadvantaged has done has been to loosen up our thinking to the point where the street academy may be more effective than the classroom--where the various kinds of programs that are held in non-school agencies tend to be more effectiv than our school program--where our opportunities that are provided for tutoring and for work study, etc., tend to be more effective than the 50-minute Carnegie Unit, etc. So that we've loosened up here our notion of who can teach, who is a teacher, who is a staff member. Therefore, when I talk about--beginning with 'instructors' I'm talking about a range of personnel. With respect to all instructors, one place to begin with respect to their teacher training is clearly in an analysis of their own biases and their own prejudices and how these operate in an instructional situation. And one way of coming at this would be to provide for a range of experiences of working with disadvantage right from the start of a teacher-training program and have an opportunity to explore and examine the reactions and the consequences of one's behavior. Little things, for example, facial expressions or the way one reacts to a speech pattern of a youngster, etc., or, we don't have time to go through that. But I'm convinced tha love is not enough and goodwill is not enough. Secondly, it seems to me that we need to provide teachers with improved procedures for diagnosis and individualization of instruction. We talked during the conference about how can you do anything with 40 kids. I think there's nothing sacred about any number of kids. And I suspect it's easier to have one kid and one teacher or one kid and one adult. Yet my own children have gone to school in England where a teacher with 42 first five-year-olds and 48 eight-year-olds and 48 ten-year-olds where there was more individualization than I see in some of our suburban schools that have 20-21 kids. I'd rather say "how can we deploy our resources for better diagnosis, better individualization, better differentiation of instruction"--I think that can be done. It will mean a shaking up of the way we teach. It will mean a shaking u of what consititutes teaching and learning in the first place. I think there's much more that one could say.

My second area of focus would, of course, be on curriculum and resources for curriculum. The notion of what constitutes relevant experiences, relevant curricula, all of this, of course, would be tied to our diagnostic procedures and our understanding of the needs and putting our focus perhaps on much more on teaching kids how to learn, or making it possible for them to use their learning skill instead of beginning with some of the readiness procedure, etc., that we deal with now. So that without ignoring or minimizing the importance of other aspects of the community, availability of resources the supervisors and the administrators that curb all of our creative teaching skills, etc., without talking about any of these other factors I would say that the place to begin, it seems to me, is on the instructional process, and it is at that point that I would back into the teacher-training process for dealing with the disadvantaged.

2. Erskine Caldwell

I suppose everyone here knows why I am here--not being a scholar myself, but a learner, I come here not to give out any advice whatsoever. I feel very much like peanut butter must feel. You know, when you're peanut butter you spread it on a piece of bread and then you put another nutritious piece of bread on top of that and you have a sandwich. Well, I feel like the peanut butter now, between these sandwiches that are being made by experts. Being in the so-called field of communication--a good example of what a writer believed to be communication, I think, was exemplified not long ago by a college student whose grades had slipped below the line, so to speak, and he was drafted into the army, much against his principles. And what happened was that when he was sent to the training camp, the sergeant noticed that this young man spent all of his free time walking around the grounds looking for scraps of paper. And when he found a scrap of paper he would pick it up and look at it, read it, and throw it aside, and say, "That's not it." Well, this went on so much that the sergeant was so baffled by this behavior that he sent him to the army psychiatrist to find out why he was always picking up paper and looking at it and throwing it away and saying, "This is not it." So after the army psychiatrist had talked to him for several hours and got no satisfactory information out of him the army psychiatrist wrote out an army discharge as being mentally unfit. So the young man looked at it, read it, and said, "That's it!" But, you know, trying to be a little bit serious about this matter as a learner, I think what really impresses me about the disadvantaged or the advantaged in college, in high school and grammar school and so forth, is the fact that there's such a gap between the early years and the later years of a writer's life. Being a writer, I will say a writer; it could be an artist, it could be anything. You know, in the early days of the kindergarten, Head Start, and so forth, children are given a freedom to do their thing. They can cut out paper dolls or they can color halloween lanterns and everything of the sort and no one criticizes the children for spending their time doing this. That's called creativ learning. Well, when a child gets up out of kindergarten, out of Head Start, and so forth, out of the primary grades, then he runs into this roadblock, so to speak. You can't do that. You've got to do it this way. And so I think he becomes a little bit stifled, in a way, if he has any creative urge at all. And, it seems to me, that there should be--I would classify this type of student as one of the disadvantaged, because he has an urge to create something--whatever it might be--he might be an inventor for all we know, but he wants to do these things himself that he's thinking of, and that appeal to him. And yet he has to conform to the rigid rules and regulations and standards that are set up for all children. Well, then you skip the years, we'll say from high school into college, and then this person comes out. Then he feels a freedom that he has had stifled in him for all these years, but he might have been conditioned to such an extent that no longer exists the creative effort that he had imbedded in him or was inherent in him to begin with. So it seems to me that exceptional child will favor just being an ordinary creative person. There should be some method for a learner not to have to go through the years of being stifled by regulations and standards that really are not helping him to be a completed creative artist or writer or musician or whatever his urge is going to be. So there, you see as a learner I'm going against the grain with these experts. They are going to tell you their policies and findings in scholarship. So I just want to be one of the outside observers who's going to say, "Well, I'll think that over. I'm not going to accept what you say, yet; but maybe I'll thank you.

3. Herbert Aurbach

It could be difficult for a professor to have to get up before an audience and speak in some kind of time limit set. I'm used to speakin in 75-minute modules and trying to regulate myself to five or ten minutes, I put down some notes. And what I decided when I had these notes down that I had the sum-total of my knowledge on this one page of paper here. As a sociologist I think I was with the whole problem of the disadvantaged by looking at terminology that we use. I think we carry with us certain implications in the terminology and I think the social scientists are very clearly to blame for the terminology that we use. Educators have adapted to terminology that we have given to them. We started out by referring to these young people as being culturally deprived. It was a pretty ethnocentric way of looking at culture. What it said is--these young people who come from black communities and Indian communities, Puerto Rican and Mexican American communities don't have a culture. They've been deprived of the privile of having the wonderful culture, the wonderful civilization that we of the white middle class have. Then we changed our terminology to talk about the culturally disadvantaged. It carried the same implication, but what it said, in effect, that--oh yes, they have a culture, but their culture isn't as good as ours. They are disadvantaged because they don't have--they don't share this culture that we have. I think perhaps, and social scientists in recent years have been turning to another term. I think one at least that doesn't carry with it the patronizing attitude and that is at least we can refer, I think, fairly reasonably to people who come from minority groups who are poor as being culturally different. And I think at least with this we don't imply any kind of superiority because certain we also recognize that Russia or England or France also have different cultures and that they--that in some ways that that difference doesn't mean that they are inferior to us. Although sometimes the American tourist gives that impression when he's abroad. This is the first thin that I would do as a social scientist in talking about the problem of-educational problems of this group of young people. I think we have to make this terminology more precise. We're talking, I think, about people who are different in terms of cultural background they have--people who are economically poor and I think that's the only real--one of the real qualities that we can talk about across the lines. Certai youngsters are educationally disadvantaged in trying to negotiate the system of a school--a school system which is structured along particular value systems which tend to be middle class and dominated by, in many instances, very racist attitudes towards people who are different. I think these are things that we can talk about. That these people are in fact, educationally disadvantaged, I think, is also correct. While as a social scientist I think also I have to take a look at some of the other impacts of social science on our understanding of these young people. I think that I would agree very completely with some of the points that Dr. Passow made that really there are many many explanations of why these young people are disadvantaged and much of it is based on research which has been overl generalized. We talk about the kinds of homes and communities they come from. I think what this has done is given us a different kind of explanation other than the genetic explanation to say why these people are really disadvantaged. I think, again, that we really don't know very much about the kinds of homes and kinds of communities and the kinds of cultures that these young people come from and its real impact on the learning process, as we have focused in on certain characteristics and we've generalized from it. We forget about the tremendous variability within these groups and about the fact that they bring into our school system many characteristics which are precisely the kind of things that might help them in the learning process. We have avoided them and have failed to identify them in the process. I think it's important for teachers and educators to recognize that the area of their effectiveness is the school. Yes these young people are poor--and culturally different--and for these reasons they're disadvantaged in negotiating this educational system that we have. So what can you do about it? We aren't going to change the culture they came from. As teachers, we can't put very much into the fact that they're poor. What we can do is do something about the kinds of experiences they have in this institution we call the school. This is the area where we can be effective as teachers, as educators. And, I think, when we recognize this, what we begin doing is looking at the school as an instrument for change as a system where change has to take place. We have to begin understanding what the structure of this school is. What is it about the school that makes learning so difficult for these young people? When we begin to focus on this,--we begin to take away the crutches we have by saying that every time a youngster isn't making it in school it's because his parents aren't motivating him or it's because he comes from an environment that doesn't prepare him adequately to deal with the system. The issue is what we're doing as educators in the school system that makes this--that accounts for the tremendous rate of failure we have in term of our recognition of failure? Remember, it's our definitions that we're using--we're the ones that set up the criteria of success and failure--and if we're failing, then as educators then we have to look within the structure of the learning process--within the structure of the institution of the school itself. There are lots of things we can, in fact, look at in these institutions, and I don't feel we have nearly enough time to begin pointing those out in the few minutes that I have here. So, if we're going to really affect educational achievement of these children, what we have to do is begin effectively changing the school as a social system--as an environment for learning This means that we really have to begin to say, "Well, what's so sacre about the ways we go about doing things?" We will have to open up the system, making it more flexible and not restricting ourself with the kind of restraints that we now have in education. We really have to begin changing the very structure in which we operate and I think that this is what is absolutely necessary if we're going to help these children to negotiate the system, it's the only way we can help them to negotiate the system. The other point that I think I ought to make here is that there probably is one precise piece of data that we can get from our research and that is, if children are going to learn in a school that they have to have a reasonably good conception of themself as a learner. They've got to have a self-concept that will allow them to believe that they can learn in that system. This is the one piece of data that I think social scientific research is pretty conclusive about. That's the only piece of data that I think I can suggest. At least I haven't seen any evidence to the contrary. Perhaps some others have, but I haven't. If this is true, then it seems to me that one of our major paths in school is to sensitize teachers to this and to the kind of culture in which these children come from so that they learn something about it in a way that will help them to respect children for what they are, as this is what I feel school does to many children. It teaches them that what they are is all bad and this is what they ought to be, this is precisely what they should not be doing. What we ought to be doing is finding the things in their culture that need reinforcement--we have to be looking for the strengths, for the contributions that their culture will bring to the learning situation. We have to quit negating what they had learned in the school. Really, what we need is teachers who respect their language, their culture, their background and who, in effect, are saying, "these are things that are real, are important to you, but when we deal with these things in the school," what we begin to do is suggest to the child that there are other things out here that might also be important to you and here are some choices for you, here are some alternatives for you, and here are different ways of saying things. Not that what you are saying is wrong, but the way that you are saying it is wrong, but here is an alternative way which you might in time negotiate that system out there that you'r going to have to eventually deal with might be a useful way of doing it. I think this is a very very important assignment for teachers, because our teachers really have not had enough understanding of this and they do not, in fact, respect the children that they have in the school--many of them do not. I suggest also, and this is my final point--that one of the most effective ways of assuring that the teacher and the administrator in the school will begin really showing this kind of respect is by bringing members of the culturally differer communities into the decision-making process of education, through new methods in addition to school board membership. In some communities I would argue very strongly for decentralization and local control. But I don't think these are enough. I think we must begin thinking about effective ways of bringing the interaction between the community and the school system to a much more--to a point where it's much more effective and much more fruitful than the kind of PTA type of arrangement that we have now, which is really not at all effective in dealing particularly with youngsters of this group. I'm not even sure it's very effective in dealing with the middle class parts of our society.

4. Charles Keith

If a historian could kind of join us and see the struggles we're going through as professional groups dealing with these issues, he might tell us that this is a regular cycle that people go through and we're just repeating it. We made a discovery in the last 15 or 20 years; the disadvantaged have been with us for generations--centuries--but professionally we discovered them. And in this discovery and learning about this, we have experienced anxiety, pain, a lot of guilt a lot of self-scrutiny within our field. In so doing and making a discovery we tend at first to generalize as speakers have already noted. In many ways we're like Columbus who comes over and the Indians come out on the canoes to meet him. He goes back to Europe and tells them about Indians and we're still trying to shake some of those--even still being called Indians, a misnomer. It's hard to shake those generalizations. But, as with the Indians, we discover as we learn more about them as individuals, we discover their differences, and a lot of our early generalizations that came with the shock of discovery. Unfortunately in the early stages of discover we have to be practical and do things and we base programs on the basis of these early generalizations. Therefore, we equate the disadvantaged with those who lack verbal skills, those who have different styles than us, etc. These programs tend to fizzle out after a while, and I think we should be somewhat tolerant of ourselves as professionals as we try to learn more about this field. So what might the psychologist or the psychiatrist have to contribute to this to this interdisciplinary approach? Just a couple of points--and they're really old points--and if they're right, then I'm sure many of you will say, "My gosh, this is what we're being taught in our first year education courses." We could keep in mind that whatever we do, the final common pathway in our endeavors still centers around the individual child; his group isn't critical, but his background is. What we finally do with the child in our classrooms centers around him and him alone, because all of our educational efforts are centered toward implanting something--imparting something to the individual child. He must come out with something from our endeavors. I think the people in child development, the child psychology-psychiatry field can continue to contribute to these endeavors by pointing to this chil and his past--his own unique individual past that is so often forgotte in programs as a start. The individual child still brings his own unique set of genes to the program that we're setting up. He doesn't leave it out there on the street. This child faces an individual teacher who transmits something to him. There are many ways she can go about this, but in the final analysis she has to give something to him--working relationship. I know of no other way to teach a child than by means of a working relationship. All of this has to go on within this very complex group of family, neighborhood that you alread heard about. I think we learned a lot about children. A lot of this is still directly applicable to new programs--the Common Pathway, and I think all too often unfortunately overlooked in our need to get something going. I think this is also much to complex for the teacher to master moment by moment as she works with her pupils. Sometimes it is hard for a group of professionals sitting around trying to get ahold of a mechanism to work with children, and we asked our teacher to go into a classroom and really keep these things in mind and utilize them day by day. So a final practical suggestion--any program that starts with this purpose on the final teacher-pupil interaction--find a common pathway, some means for the teacher to get her day by day, month by month performance with the Johnnys and the Marys no matter what type of disadvantaged background they come from.

5. Raymond Patouillet

I think at the outset I should say that any similarity with my description of guidance and your experience with it is wholly unexpected. I think that the field of guidance has something to contribute to the education of the disadvantaged. Let me begin quickly with a connotation of guidance. Guidance professionals like to think they are concerned with the individualization of learning as we have discussed. We like to think that we are in the business of developing the student, but as a learner in the school setting, therefore, there's a double focus. There's a focus on the individual within a particular kind of role and in a particular setting--the school. Guidance people would be well advised not to consider themselves as remakers of personality, but perhaps to focus on the child as a learner. In this meeting, we talked about the school being in difficulty because it hasn't done a good job. In terms of its individual function, we have turned and leaned on psychology for years. Counseling, as you know, is not going to move in a direction if acceptance of the individual is not the paramount characteristic. Therefore, acceptance of individual is not merely a shibboleth for guidance people: it is a requirement for survival. However, we have found that counseling alone isn't going to do the job. Guidance people need to share with our fellow workers the insights of our labors; in doing this we talk about consulting--we consult with teachers--we consult with parents. However, we are feeling an increasing need to become more involved with the school as a social institution and facilitator of a learning climate. Learning climate and environment remain closely interrelated. I think it's fair to say that the quality of interpersonal relationships is perhaps the most important factor in deciding the effectiveness of teaching. However, these relationships are largely determined by roles which we play. These roles are reflections of the structure. The kind of relationshi I have with my son, or the kind of relationship I have with my wife, or with a student are different. They are essentially different because of roles that are different that I play. Personally, it's exciting to consider the possibility that the counselor is in a rather unique situation in the school to play roles as mediator/mobilizer/initiator in a school system. Addressing the problems we face as viewing the struggles between teachers and principals, for example, who is the mediator? The principal may view himself as a mediator, however he is perhaps more effectively and accurately viewed by others as a father-figure, effectively becoming a judge and jury all in one. I think therefore, that guidance people, with somewhat appropriate training than they typically get at the moment, could make a significa contribution in this sorely needed mediating function. Mediation migh also take place between teachers and faculty and between the "inner" and "outer" worlds of the learner. An example might be to explain to the principal that he is controlling what is, by definition, a faculty meeting. I group these techniques under the heading "human relations skills and group dynamics" which, I feel has great usage potential within the schools.

6. Fred Gearing

Speaking about the disadvantaged, their life in school is not a happy one. To give you an example, it wasn't too many months ago when some very nice people who were friends of relatives said, "Come to my house for dinner." And they had ourself--myself--and two other couples and this guy, the host, knew about orange trees because that was his occupational role; he had been to India to talk with Indians in India about orange trees and had come back, and we had a very nice meal and all that. After the meal we saw some silent movies he had taken on his trip and I quickly discovered, as has been discovered in educationa circles, that if a film does not have a sound track it can really be educational because people are compelled to talk. During the presentation of this film, the chit-chat going along tended to be, "Hey that's a pretty piece of cloth," and "Oh my, look at that." Also, about every five minutes someone would say (I was sitting there trying to be as inconspicuous as possible), "But it's their way of life." I did not want to take issue with these statements, however, I believed that somehow or another it is an individual's anthropological bias that causes him to say, "But it's their way of life." I raised that little point because it seems to me the mystery is not that obviously in all sub-groups in society there are sub-cultures. They are historically existent and neither hidden or secret. They mystery is that we don't know already and that we have to tell ourselves these things at this date. There's nothing all that global or hard and difficult about goir in and finding out how people acted. In investigating these cultures, somehow or another, I think the problem is not how we find out about these sub-cultures, the problem is what do we know about them already and why aren't we acting on that knowledge. In other words, it seems to me the mystery lies in structure of society and things having to do with money and power and the manner in which it does/doesn't flow. Within this study, the idea develops that those individuals involved in the educational institutions, schools and universities spearhead the social revolution and it just happens that as to which of these two institutions--schools or universities--are the most vulnerable, I don't know. However, these two institutions have got to be the two most vulnerable in American society and the least able to spearhead anything. The problem is then to be understood as survival in the school and in the universities. My emphasis is on how we can survive given a wild, wild world around us. As to disadvantaged, I have very simplistic notions that there are people who are poor, and the problem with being poor is that you don't have any money; and that money is the solution. Also, that there are people who are poor who by and large also are weak. And the problem of being weak is that you don't have power. And that's the solution to that. However, I think, the other side of that coin is, that if you look back at anything that is known about the sub-cultures in American life that we're talking about; I know something about Indians, and vicariously you know things about others--and analyze the differences. There, simply, is no incompatibility between each and every one of those sub-cultures and anything we might reasonably call education there is no incompatibili to education per se. Parents want their kids to read, and children do also. There simply isn't in the cultures as such, anything that runs across the grain, anything against the current, when discussing education within a delimited perspective as typified by the 3 R's, which are, after all, all you need to know to get into college. Let me speak just one minute about school to try to find a solution. When discussing fundamental roles of the schools, educators must analyze whether they are talking about the rhetoric that flies around in the society at large; the thoughts/concepts underlying the verbage needs to be analyzed to look at what the schools do. Concerning the schools, it seems to me it's perfectly obvious they succeed enormously at the real functional task that the society, in effect, has laid out for them, which is, of course, the continuation of the status quo, as schools are simulations of the status quo. Schools are places where you go in if you're young or you're old and re-enact that simulacrum of American society manipulated by those people who are close to the levers of powers--and at the obvious expense of people who are further disenfranchised. Schools are simulations--re-enactments of American life as selectively screened by those near the centers of power. It seems to me to be hardly debatable but I never hear it said, so to speak. It may be because it's not--it seems so obvious that I just have to repeat it at this juncture. I don't think this is a function of the poverty of spirit among peoples involved in universities and schools, nor is it a problem of failure of nerve of lack of will or any of these things; it has to do with real gut forces operating in society at large. In our present position, and I think to a man, at any rate, never mind you or I--I don't like the status quo. I do not like the status quo and I'm in a situation of having to survive in an institution, as I think you are, which is, in reality, geared up to recapitulate the status quo. Therefore, what do we do to survive and get our little licks along the way? It seems to me that you put the three things I've said together; one, that the schools as institutions are really simulations of American society as selectively screened by those near the center of power; two, the fact that there is no discrepancy between education in the 3 R's sense in any of these sub-cultures we're talking about. Put those things together, then you have a theory and how you account for failure or what you do about it and so on. Well, it seems to me to put it much too emphasis on schools, because they are what they are, and constitute a very strange environment for persons coming out of some other culture other than that aspect of the sub-culture re-enacted in a school. At the most simple level, kids come in don't get the picture. That's a kind of game--that has a style to it and there's nothing really going to go on there, but you're supposed to play a certain game this way. And I didn't ever have to learn that, you know, learn from where I was born' I knew it from the start. To explain, the first I Q. test I ever took was as an adult; being from the South we didn't have those at that time. When I went into the army I took this test, never occurring to me that it was anything but a game the designer of the test was inviting me to play with him, and I kind of knew the rules--no one told me, I just knew it. School, in general, is analagous to that. The first thing is that kids come into this milieu just don't get that picture. They're in some degree of trouble because of that. The second thing, more seriously, is that you do engage in some task activities in this game--like structure which move because the schools are operationalized in an interpersonal relation style: it's a style of interaction that rubs you the wrong way. Much more seriously, because the schools are what they are, they really do constitute a total assault on the identities of children coming from various sub-cultures--a real assault, however unintentional, and it doesn't matter whether you say, "I love you, Johnny." You know, it's in your affective behavior you're saying, "You know, you better shape up, man, because that isn't the way it is and don't say 'ain't' and all that." The question is, therefore, how do you survive in a situation which schools or institutions do that kind of thing--there really is no incongruence between sub-cultures and what we narrowly call education; we fail because of extraneous things, this assault of identity and other things. How do you survive? I think the essential thing one does is to look out for those kinds of things that can be done in a classroom so that the teacher can see better what is going on in that classroom with those kids. That's it, it comes down to that one simple thing. Anything and everything that one can imagine doing that enables the teacher to see that behavior, see that child, see that child in his interaction with another child, what's he saying when he did that to that other child, what's he saying to me when he behaves this way, etc. The things that can be done to make precise and accurate and humane the simple communication problem within that classroom. A couple of examples A teacher in his head says, "I think he wants to start thinking better about communication may say, you know, 'button, button, who's got the button?' Looking at school systems in the community at large as power systems and sort of delineat who's exercising authority on whom, you already got a diagram of communication flow. The power situation is such that, you know, you tune in--you're really curious about what's going on in the classroom in the school--you tune in on the power facts and get them and then you see the communication flow as it in reality is. There are two implications of this one in situation inside a classroom you kind of give up power that someone gave you, you know, if you can do it. In the external society obviously you come out with, you know, red power--black power--vocal power--all kinds of power--intellectual power. Second, certain kind of knowledge helps, and allow me to posit an example. There's a new field called the socio-linguistics of communication here's a whole very exciting new field in linguistics that is emerging around a very simple fact that everyone of us knew and have always known, but somehow or another it gets by you. Simply stated it is this everyone of us has five or six dialects, utilizing them in relation to occasion and location. The learning and research situations are under what occasions do you turn on what dialect--whoever you are? The second is, how do you learn to turn on this repertoire of dialects appropriately. The learning process is not only learning the language, but also learning when to use the language--this language as against that language. It is my belief that situations like this ought to be within the scope of teacher training programs. A third thing that should be mentioned is that classroom structure, that set of curricula, those devices, those procedures, that which makes up the shape of the day is good by this criteria or bad by this same criteria. That which allows the teacher to view the child in his individual performance and his individual expression, but allows the teacher to view the child that way, not as a social isolate, but sees him in his real interactions with other children and other audiences is of the greatest use. Those kinds of curricula that affect us positively are good. Those kinds of classroom organizations--heterogeneous groupings, for example, of all kinds. I wouldn't, if I had a choice, teach a class unless it's three grade levels, at the very least. All of these things help in those respects. In reality, it's a survival problem and I'm just saying the only answer to it for us who have to survive in and get in our little licks along the way, is the capacity to see. Those things which help us to see these behaviors as they unfold are good; things that hinder that are bad.

7. Edward Fagan

Thus far in the sensorium, I've heard several things with respect to language education things which tend to imply that much of what we do in communication "folds, spindles and mutilates" students. To that end I'd like to explain areas where English in today's classroom might be more effectively utilized to ameliorate this particular phenomenon. You notice, for example, that Mr. Caldwell referred to the "grammar" school rather than 'elementary' school. We are familiar with Winston's latest blast 'tastes good like a cigarette should'; this is the steroetype of language and the kind of correctness, that, I think has the sequela of hamburgerizing kids when they enter an environment where that kind of prescriptive correctness is a requireme for status advancement. Due to the time factor, I would like to simply identify five areas where the study of English has changed its dimension--and that dimension where English, in its changed dimension, might effectively be utilized in a classroom and then summerize by concentrating on one of the five so called language areas. First, as I've already mentioned, language would be a major concern of the new approach to communication in the classroom; however, this particular situation has some problems of packaging. A second major area is the interdisciplinary study as an approach to English. The idea here is that since language is employed in every discipline--arithmetic, social studies, science--that English should not be confined to a prescriptiv or isolated approach. Therefore, you may, for example, talk about the communication and the style of communication and its implication withi science, within social studies and other subject areas. This would be the interdisciplinary approach. The third area is that of behaviora objectives. What competencies, what skills are these kids to arrive at after a particular experience? The experiences are they to have in the classroom? Are these skills observable? If observed, what kind of criteria would you use for ascertaining whether (1) the behavior should appear in class in the first place and (2) whether the material and/or behavior is ameliorated within the constraints/goals of the school system. A fourth area, and one previously mentioned, is the individualized instruction area. However, this approach presupposes that teachers have a detailed knowledge of such things as behaviors, that they are well aware of the diagnostic systems that can be employe and that by using these particular systems there would be some kind of reward for the kids in the classroom. A final area which is implici throughout these four areas is that, in moving to a more open, flexibl approach to curriculum, the role of electives throughout the school program will become increasingly important. The high school riots, and strikes particularly, are beginning to reflect this "relevancy" (a term I don't like because it's too much a cliche' now), however, in fact, what is so sacred about a four year English program? Also, why must it be constrained within a 50 minute period, a Carnegie Unit? On those grounds, what alternatives are available? There are programs throughout the country where the whole senior high school program has become elective and a student who's interested in short story writing and analysis of news media and the psychoanalysis of

Spiro Agnew, these kinds of things, are all possibilities within the realm of English. Therefore, these five areas; to summarize, language, interdisciplinary study, behavioral objectives, individual instruction and elective programs are, I think, strategies that the current communications approaches emphasize. To focus more specifically on linguistics, there are three major areas--prescriptive, descriptive and transformational. The prescriptive area is typified by the Winston ad where the teacher is always correct. The descriptive is more anthropoligical, however, somewhat far removed from the classroom. In this approach the acceptance is of whatever is current and new. It is the kind of language that one should engage in and the student should engage in within the classroom. The third and the most restrictive, in several ways, is a type of English called transformational grammar. It's a--the word derived from the fact that there are allegedly certain kernel sentences in language, and that when a kid walks into a classroom, like kindergarten, he already has imbedded in his nervous system ways of transformation of grammar as it's currently used in many classrooms. Although there are some benefits to come from transformational grammar, as it's presently taught in most classrooms these three concepts of linguistics are somewhat in conflict. With respect to dialects and the study of dialects; there is an assumption that the way that we work with some of these kids is to transform dialect into acceptable language. Acceptable, being, of course, middle class standard English, whatever that is. Within this context, the strategies used by foreign language, teaching are supposed to be the things that most effective in the classroom. In teaching English as a second language, teachers set up blocks and structures and have kids come and fill in the slots and so forth. Students recognize quickly that this is a game. No one ever talks like those slot structures; no one ever fits into that kind of thing, and to that extent they either play the game or, as in most cases, don't play the game and say, "This is not the way people talk, or learn things." From that particular content a more viable approach to linguistics would be the language experiences in the classroom which are related to real life. In this case, you get what is known as "sensory bombardment" which is the kind of thing the foreign service employs in teaching adults a foreign language, there are all kinds of films, film strips, records, dialogues, tape recordings, and other audio-visual aids, constantly attempting to provide all kinds of interesting things to students and to give them the opportunity to explore the ranges of possibilities of language. One of the directors in Washington, has come up with two neat classifications, maybe too neat, for this kind of approach. One, he says, is that you have a message which is constant, but the image changes. Now what he means by that is, let's say you have a message that can be stated like this, "The train will arrive at four O'clock this afternoon." Another approach to language teaching is the Moffatt approach. Moffatt was at Harvard and is now with the University of California at Berkley. He has developed a student-centered language arts program K through 13.

The impact here is on a gestalt of the program. Usually we do things piecemeal, however, this is a total program based on the student generated material, material from their writings, classroom activities, tape recordings, and things like that. Out of that kind of language experience is the kind of openness, the kind of flexibility in language instruction environment will probably be the most effective.

SELECTED POINT OF VIEW

Child in the School

"When a child first goes into school, he may not be functioning at an adaptive level for survival--and more expected of him than just the mere survival type. He may find himself, as you say, exploring the situation, looking it over and if it doesn't relate very personally to him he may not venture into that situation, because it is not relevant to his needs--as he views his needs. The way he views his needs may make a difference than what his teacher views his needs." (Patouillet)

Classroom Behavioral Expectations

". . . I don't think I can give the answers as a sociologist of what ought to be the behavioral expectations of a particular classroom. I think that becomes something that the teachers and the parents and the supervisory people have to work out for themselves. I would argue that as soon as the kids are old enough they ought to play a role in that too. And maybe even at the very beginning to some extent. So that the behavioral expectations ought to be continually changing." (Aurbach)

Creativity

"There should be some method for a learner not to have to go through the years of being stifled by regulations and standards that really are not helping him to be a completed creative artist or writer or musician or whatever his urge is going to be." (Caldwell)

"Well, when a child gets up out of kindergarten, out of Head Start, and so forth, out of the primary grades, then he runs into this roadblock, so to speak. You can't do that. You've got to do it this way. And so I think he becomes a little bit stifled, in a way, if he has any creative urge at all." (Caldwell)

Culture

"All right, as I look at an alien culture somewhere and elicit the code, I see there myself. Because I have now seen through the code to the man that I am and they are and therefore, we are, and that's the payoff and it's all over. And I come back saying cultures are good. They're equally good and equally bad, you know, so to speak. They're equivalent. They're all human and it's the job to see oneself which is to see man in that other place." (Gearing)

"If you live in a culture designed for your kind of people in these simple terms, then it's a good culture, it's a fine culture for you in most cases. If you live in a culture which is designed for somebody else and designed to exclude you, for the most part, this cannot be considered a culture as good as the culture could be considered from the other standpoint. So in that particular way I don't think we can equate culture and say they're all equally successful." (Aurbach)

"I say all cultures and subcultures are equivalently benighted at this point in time--they're locked into vocabularies that usually are 'we-they'--often sometimes, you know, are sort of 'parochial we' and virtually never 'universal we' types of vocabularies." (Gearing)

Community Control

"I think the whole notion of community control has become a cliche and I don't know whether we want to go off on that. There's no community control in any situation that I know of--real community control--but you have in most situations is a group of individuals or groups jockeying for power and at one time in the ascendancy--one group is in the ascendancy and in power--another group is in the ascendancy." (Aurbach)

Communication

"Communication or a way of reaching. Now saying I can't reach that child. How many times have I asked that question to myself. If I am not able to reach that child then the most part of it I don't understand to myself. That's why I am not being able to reach him. I think there is some sort of identity among all of us with the self." (Aurbach)

Disadvantaged

"Then we changed our terminology to talk about the culturally disadvantaged. It carried the same implication, but what it said in effect that--oh yes, they have a culture, but their culture isn't as good as ours. They are disadvantaged because they don't have--they don't share this culture that we have." (Aurbach)

"I don't think that when we talk about the difference between the culture of France and the culture of the United States that one necessarily connotes any superiority or inferiority. . . . and I think the same thing should be true in terms of looking at Blacks and Whites or Indians and Whites in the United States. Or the differences between the Hindu and Moslem religions in India." (Aurbach)

"And disadvantaged kids, poor kids, slum kids--we insist that they go to school. We insist that they learn academics. And we measure them by whether they do learn academics or not. This is where we measure their success or failure." (Dwyer)

"First of all, it seems to me that in a certain sense all of our pupils are disadvantaged if we consider that all education which does not provide for the fullest development of the individual potential. That is, education today is in a sad state and therefore all people are disadvantaged." (Passow)

"Labeling, categorizing, giving a symbolic name to classify a group has been considered as an administrative construct with a goal in mind that this will facilitate the functioning of the group. This is some what optimistic and positivistic argument in favor of labeling children. A group of children, focus of our discussion, have been given variety of labels such as disaffected, disadvantaged, needy, poor, slow learner, slow gifted, etc. The participant of the conference discussed to great length the ramification and impacts of labeling. Despite of the fact that the category and classification as a tool has some legal utility as the congress and people like to know what is being done for certain group but classifications in itself has caused enormous problems in that it gets teachers to treat children as though they are disadvantaged. (Fagan)

". . . I personally prefer the term disaffected and try to qualify that term by saying that this term applies to all children, not just the so called disadvantaged and their reaction to or cop out from the present system of education. (Fagan)

"I think it's rather unfortunate that social scientists have coined terms like culturally deprived. I think we have to talk a little bit about what we mean by these terms. It seems to me that the most unfortunate term of all is the idea of culturally deprived. I can't vision since no human being who grows up in a culture can be deprived of that culture. He comes into society with a culture, he is born into a culture, he is raised in that culture. I think again it tends to be the kind of conceptualization that whatever culture I have is the proper one and anybody who hasn't got it is deprived. And it's about as egocentric as we can get. I think we tend to do the same thing with the term disadvantaged. The concept is that our culture is the advantaged culture and everything else is disadvantaged in comparison. And I think this is a problem--a serious problem. We use these terms particularly towards minority groups, it becomes very paternalistic or racist in their connotation. Anthropologists and sociologists would agree that we should look at it as just culturally different. Culturally different doesn't presume any superiority or inferiority." (Aurbach)

Equality of Opportunity

"Now, the whole notion of equality of opportunity is again a notion that needs analysis because equality again depends upon one's belief as to whether we're talking about equality of input, whether we're talking about equality of output, whether we're talking about equality of results, etc." (Passow)

Grading

"It's interesting--it's impossible to think of something without a grading system." (Patouillet)

Environment and Learning

"Is there any reason why they can't learn the hard core? No, there i no reason why they can't learn the hard core. I don't think there's anything in environment that will erase this kind of thing. There may not be anything in environment that will reinforce it, and that's important, but I don't think there's anything that would particularly erase it." (Dwyer)

Guidance

"And counseling, as you know, is hardly going to move in any directio if acceptance of the individual is not the paramount characteristic o relationship. And so acceptance of individuals is not just a verbalization for guidance people--it is a requirement for survival." (Patouillet)

Learning

"It may be tension producing, but maybe the best learning is the kind of learning that goes on that you are not consciously aware that you are pushing away a barrier and that the change is coming in a more integrated way. If the person doesn't fixate onto categories or things of this nature, well, then the person has nothing to relearn and I guess maybe we're talking about relearning. But possibly relearning if it's kind of an organic exploration and a finding out about things in a dissatisfied curiosity, I don't know--I think we may be getting at something in terms of how we do that only until something is structured and set--and we call it knowledge and maybe learning is the abandonment of this kind of attitude--I don't know. Well, anyway, it sure is hard to teach 5 year old kids to read and write and do arithmetic if you don't do it a natural way." (Dwyer)

Linguistics

"I think the idea that their language is wrong and that our language is right is something that just has to be wiped out." (Fagan)

"The first thing that you've got to do with children is to get them to express themselves and communicate both in writing and in reading in a way that they're comfortable with. That's the first step. I think at some point you have to suggest to them that there are alternative ways of saying the same thing that they were saying. And they'll learn it and they'll accept that as long as at the same time you're not saying what they're saying is wrong."

"How many times have you heard people say, "Gee, I don't speak any dialect" who speak a particular dialect because they think that's just language and all the other things are dialect. These are the people who are disadvantaged." (Fagan)

"Now to focus more specifically on linguistics--as you know, there are three major areas of linguistics--prescriptive, descriptive and transformational. The prescriptive area is typified by Winston, where the teacher is always correct. The descriptive is more anthropological, but still somewhat far out with respect to the classroom. And there the acceptance is that whatever is current and news is the kind of language that one should engage in and the studen should engage in the classroom. The third and the most restrictive, I think in several ways is a type called transformational grammar. It's word comes from the fact that there are allegedly certain kernel sentences in the language and that when a kid walks into a classroom like kindergarten he already has embedded in his nervous system ways of transforming these kernel sentences to communicate different ideas such as, time, things like that. The problem that transformation of grammar as currently used in many classrooms is that you switch from the stilt walking diagram to what is called a programmed diagram and allegedly there are some benefits to come from transformation of grammar, but as it's presently taught in most classrooms these three areas of linguistics are somewhat in conflict. (Fagan)

"There's a new field called the sociolinguistics. . . . here is a whole very exciting new field in linguistics that is emerging around a very simple fact that everyone of us knew and have always known but somehow or another it gets by you. Simply stated it is this: everyone of us has five or six dialects. We turn them on and off according to occasion. The learning and research situations are under what occasions do you turn on what dialect you are? The second is, how do you learn to turn on this repertoire of dialects appropriately. The learning process not of learning the language, but of learning when to use the language--this language as against that language." (Gearing)

Parent Teacher Relationships

"I as an educator hopefully know a little bit more about teaching arithmetic than parents do. On the other hand, there is very very much they know about their child that I do not know and the child can learn better with both of us than with either one of us alone. And I think this is important where you have a partnership. Not that we don't have certain expertise and not that the parents don't but respect each other." (Passow)

Power

"I'd like to bring up one question and that's on the power. And I feel that in trying to give some power to the poor and powerless it is very important that they earn the power and it isn't just given and I'd like for us perhaps to examine ways in which power can be earned." (Aurbach)

School as a Community Agency

". . . this is really what has to be done is that you really have to begin to think about what do you really believe the school ought to be doing and that's a community process." (Aurbach)

Teacher Self-Training

"And it's my feeling that for any classroom situation to really work like we're talking about for disadvantaged kids and other types of kids, there has to be built in some kind of monitoring system where the teacher feels free enough to talk about really what's happening and all these processes and get some kind of feedback. Without this she's human, she experiences anxiety, she gets locked into rigid roles, and you get a lot of stereotypes about the classroom." (Caldwell)

Relationship Teacher, Child and Social Groups are Interdependent

"But it would seem to me there was another ingredient which I think is implicit in many of the things we've said and that is to focus on the necessity of teachers enhancing the self-concept of children. And by doing so, I think this means more than just sensitized to the culture in which that child operates. Sensitized in a way that will lead to respect for the child as a person and as a member of a sub-cultural group in the society which would mean, it seems to me also, in order to do this you almost have to have the involvement of the social groups in the decision-making process in the school system." (Passow)

Teaching Styles

"So I think we should develop styles of teaching that make reading and mathematics as purposeful now to the child as language was when he was a year and a half when his parents, who didn't have any kind of academic experience at all, taught it in a very natural way." (Dwyer)

Appendix A

October 28, 1969

Dear

The teacher training program for the potentially handicapped (culturally disadvantaged, nursery through third-grade), in the College of Education at the University of South Florida, is planning to conduct a 3-day Symposium related to educational implications for the disadvantaged youth, sometime during the Winter quarter.

There are several reasons for initiating such a symposium 1) the University of South Florida is the only State university (100,000 people within a 30 mile radius of the campus) 2) our on-going graduate program to train teachers to work with disadvantaged children has, this year, been awarded 15 experienced teacher Fellowships and 20 prospective teacher Fellowships under the Education Professions Development Act; 3) the University is currently involved with several Latin American countries facing similar problems dealing with disadvantaged.

Knowing your interest and tremendous contributions on the education of disadvantaged children, we feel your suggestions and comments would be of great value to us and will appreciate any assistance you might give us to make the symposium a success.

For your information, we are enclosing the abstract of our proposal funded under EPDA,

Sincerely,

S.P Singh, Ed.D.
Program Chairman for
Interdisciplinary
Sensorium

Encl. 1

Appendix B

May 19, 1970

Dear

I would like to brief you on our Interdisciplinary Sensorium that will take place on June 8th, 9th, and 10th. At the present time, the following goals are being suggested for the interchange and dialogue

1. Each participant will state his disciplines' stand related to the alleviation of the problems of the disadvantaged and

2. will interact and interchange ideas with individuals of other disciplines and generate new hypothesis for his discipline and formulate suggestions for others and

3. will interact with graduate students and the faculty.

There will be four sessions. The first session will be devoted to formulating the ground rules for discussion and each individual will discuss his stand related to the problems of disadvantaged. The second session will be devoted to the general interchange and dialogue on the stands and ground rules established during the first session. In the latter part of the second session, the group may start formulating new hypothesis and ideas. The third session would be devoted to the synthesis of interchange and dialogue of the first two sessions. The following fourth session will be an open session in which the graduate students, faculty and staff will be invited to attend and the group will try to create discussions around the synthesis of ideas and hypothesis derived during the third session.

All of these sessions will be taped and transcribed and, after editing, will be published.

I will send the final format of the Sensorium to you as soon as I receive suggestions and comments from the participants. The idea and concept of the Sensorium will need your best wishes for its success. Thank you.

Sincerely,

S. P. Singh, Ed.D
Program Chairman for
Interdisciplinary Seminar